1. **LOGIN INFORMATION TO ATTEND VIA ZOOM**

**Join Zoom Meeting**
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87284289668?pwd=cGdmaFhLd0dIVUp0VFdSbGNPZDFXUT09
Meeting ID: 872 8428 9668
Passcode: 456427

**Call in (no internet)**
253-215-8782
Meeting ID: 872 8428 9668
Passcode: 456427

2. **CALL TO ORDER**

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

4. **ROLL CALL**

5. **CONSENT AGENDA:**
(The items on the Consent Agenda are normally considered in a single motion. Any item may be removed for separate consideration upon request by any member of the Council.)

   A. **Approval of June 21, 2021 City Council Regular Session Agenda**

   B. **Approval of June 7, 2021 City Council Minutes.**

      □ City Council - Regular Session - 07 Jun 2021 - Minutes

   C. **Resolution No. 2153 - Reappointing Nunnenkamp Silverman and Bernards to the Parks & Rec Board for a term through June 30, 2023**

      □ Res. No. 2153 - Reappointing Doug Nunnenkamp Emily Silverman & Michael Bernards to the Parks & Rec Board for a term thru June 30 2023

   D. **Res. No. 2155 - Appointing Tim Schallich to the North Plains Library Board for a term through June 30, 2025**

      □ Res. No. 2155 - Appointing Tim Schallich to the NP Library Board through June 30 2025

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT:**
We encourage those wishing to comment to do so in advance of the meeting by emailing comments to info@northplains.org. Comments will be read into the record. Persons wishing to speak on matters not on the agenda may be recognized at this time.

7. PRESENTATION

8. STAFF REPORTS
   A. **Library Director’s Monthly Department Report**
      □ Library Directors Staff Report June 2021
   B. **Chief of Police Monthly Department Report**
      □ Police Chief Staff Report June 2021
   C. **Public Works Director’s Monthly Department Report**
      □ Public Works Director Staff Report - June 2021
   D. **Finance Director’s Monthly Department Report**
      □ Finance Staff Report June 2021
   E. **Land use applications for the previous month**
      □ Current Land Use Application Index thru June 14 2021

9. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCES:
   A. **Land Use Appeal - File 21-017 Brynhill Master Plan Refinement**
      □ Appeal of 21-017 Brynhill Master Plan Refinement- Staff Report
      □ Exhibit A - Submitted Appeal Materials
      □ Exhibit B - Original Staff Report to PC dated May 5, 2021
      □ Exhibit C - Planning Commission Notice of Decision dated May 13 2021
      □ Exhibit D - Narrative & Plan Sheet 3.1 submitted March 30, 2021 for City File 21-017

10. RESOLUTIONS:
   A. **Resolution No. 2154 - Adopting FY22-27 CIP**
      □ Res 2154 CIP Adoption Staff Report 06.21.21
      □ Res. No. 2154 - Adopting the 2022-2027 CIP with Exhibit A

11. NEW BUSINESS:
12. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
13. REPORTS
   A. **City Manager Report**
      □ City Manager Staff Report 6.21.2021
   B. **Council Reports**
   C. **Review July 2021 Council Calendar**
      □ 2021 July All Meetings
      □ 2021 Calendar of NP City meetings
      □ 2021 Council Committee Appointments

14. ADJOURNMENT:
North Plains City Council meetings are accessible for disabled individuals. The City will also endeavor to provide services for persons with impaired hearing or vision and other services, if requested, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. To obtain services, please call City Hall at (503) 647-5555

The following City Council Meetings are scheduled to be held at:
Jessie Mays Community Center - 30975 NW Hillcrest Street  North Plains, OR

The meetings will be held on the following dates at 7:00 p.m.:
No Meeting 1st week in July  Monday, July 19, 2021  Monday, August 2, 2021
1 LOGIN INFORMATION TO ATTEND VIA ZOOM

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89193576148?pwd=eGh1VVIc3lDTXhrV2IPrZNNUWhZZz09
Meeting ID: 891 9357 6148
Passcode: 326239

Phone in (no internet)
253-215-8782
Meeting ID: 891 9357 6148
Passcode: 326239

2 CALL TO ORDER:  7:00 pm

3 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4 ROLL CALL
    a)  All Councilors in attendance

5 CONSENT AGENDA:
(The items on the Consent Agenda are normally considered in a single motion. Any item
may be removed for separate consideration upon request by any member of the Council.)

    a)  Approval of June 7, 2021 City Council Regular Session Agenda
    b)  Approval of May 17, 2021 City Council Minutes.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda.
Moved by Councilor Sheldon. Second by Councilor Papen.
Motion was approved unanimously.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT:  NONE
7 PRESENTATION

a) Garbarino Presentation

Anthony Garbarino from Garbarino Disposal and Recycling gave a PowerPoint presentation that included information on the 2021 Cleanup Day, possibly starting a Composting Program in North Plains, a 2020 Rate Review and upcoming fee increase, and the possibility of starting and expanded recycling program in town if there is enough interest from residents.

Questions and brief discussion.

All were in agreement that this year's Clean Up Day was the best yet, mainly due to the change in location from Jessie Mays Community Center to St. Edwards Catholic Church where there is a lot more room. The hope it to continue to have it at the new location going forward.

It was agreed that the conversation on an expanded recycling program should continue.

b) Pauly Rogers & Co - Audit Presentation

Tara Kamp with Pauly Rogers & Co. gave a brief presentation regarding this year's audit.

Questions and discussion ensued. On the items where there was/were deficiencies Kamp said that a plan of action must be created and approved by City Council and then submitted to the State Audit department. Kamp was asked if the City will be fined for any of the deficiencies. Kamp said not to her knowledge.

8 RESOLUTIONS:

a) Res. No. 2149 - Adopting the 22-23 Biennium North Plains City Budget

Move to adopt Resolution No. 2149 - Adopting the Budget, Making Appropriations and Declaring Ad Valorem Tax Levy for Fiscal Biennium 2022-23

Moved by Councilor Sheldon. Second by Councilor Smith.

Motion was approved unanimously.

b) Res. No. 2150 - Certifying State Revenue Sharing Qualifications

Move to adopt Resolution No. 2150 - Certifying the Provision of Municipal Services Enumerated in ORS 221.760 and Establishing the Eligibility of the City to Receive State-Shared Revenues for Fiscal Year 2021-22

Moved by Councilor Kindel. Second by Councilor Sheldon.

Motion was approved unanimously.

c) Res. No. 2151 - Electing to Receive State Shared Revenues

Move to Adopt Resolution No. 2151 - Declaring the City’s Election to Receive State Shared Revenues for Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Moved by Councilor Kindel. Second by Councilor Fage.

Motion was approved unanimously.
NEW BUSINESS: NONE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: NONE

REPORTS

a) City Manager Report

City Manager Varner thanked Public Works employee Andrew Heritage for assisting with a fire at the mill in town over the past weekend. Varner gave a brief overview of the audit process and said that the findings in this year's audit are very standard. There are plans in place to correct those few issues noted in the audit.

Varner then said that there will be an appeal from Brynhill on a land use decision that was denied by the Planning Commission at their May 12, 2021 meeting on the June 21, 2021 City Council agenda. Because of that denial the issue becomes a legislative issue with City Council making the final decision on the appeal. City Planner Heather Austin will be providing the staff report laying out why the Planning Commission denied that request.

At this point in time there are still plans to hold the 4th of July fireworks at Pumpkin Ridge Golf Course (PRGC). Varner said he is meeting with NPEA and the people at PRGC this Friday and will have more information after that meeting. Brief questions and discussion.

Varner said that more traffic signage will be put up in Sunset Ridge prior to the start of the 2021-22 school year. Hillsboro School District is bringing in a Traffic Engineer this summer to assist with this project and there will be more discussion in the coming weeks.

With regards to Sunset Ridge, Councilor Smith asked if there is a timeline for the commercial business (es) that are in the Master Plan to be put in at Sunset Ridge II. Councilor Papen said that she spoke City Planner Heather Austin about this and Austin said that it is up to the property developers.

Councilor Smith then asked if the West Union Pedestrian Path is still on schedule to be completed by the start of the 2021-22 school year. Varner said, yes, that is still the plan.

Councilor Smith then asked for an update on the wayfarer signs that still aren't put up. Varner said that Aaken Corp. is installing them when their schedule allows. Councilor Sheldon said the hope is that they will be installed by the end of this month.

Councilor Smith then asked if any other councilors share his interest in having an electronic reader board at the corner of Glencoe and Commercial Street. Mayor Lenahan noted that there is a new manager at the Columbia Bank in North Plains and she suggested that someone pay them a visit to discuss the possibility of announcing city events on their reader board (the previous bank manager said there was a policy against that). Councilor Fage said he will reach out to start that conversation with the bank manager.

Councilor Smith then asked if there might possibly be any interest in North Plains getting a "Sister City". Mayor Lenahan said that she has spoken to someone that is
interested in this topic and she offered to discuss the topic offline with Councilor Smith.
Councilor Fage asked why the 4th of July fireworks are not being held over the lake just north of town. Mayor Lenahan said that the property owners of that land are not interested in participating in having the fireworks on their property. City Manager Varner said that we are very limited with locations to hold fireworks due to concerns of Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R) and the dry conditions we have that time of year.

b) **Council Reports**

Councilor Fage said he attended the May 19, 2021 Library Board meeting. They are looking for a new member to fill a vacancy on the board. Mayor Lenahan said there was a good turnout at the Memorial Day event at the Veterans Park. There was an 'unplanned' helicopter fly-over that was a great addition to the event. The City received the Seven Seals Award and Mayor Lenahan will drop the plaque off at City Hall for display.

c) **Review June 2021 Council Calendar**

12 ADJOURNMENT: 8:21 pm

________________________________________

Teri Lenahan, Mayor

c

________________________________________

Lori Lesmeister, City Recorder Date Approved ___________________
RESOLUTION NO. 2153

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORTH PLAINS, OREGON, RE-APPOINTING DOUG NUNNENKAMP, EMILY SILVERMAN AND MICHAEL BERNARDS TO THE NORTH PLAINS PARKS & RECREATION BOARD

WHEREAS, Municipal Code Section 1.40 provides that the City Council appoints the members of the North Plains Parks & Recreation Board by resolution; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 424 established the North Plains Parks & Recreation Board to be composed of seven members; and

WHEREAS, Doug Nunnenkamp, Emily Silverman and Michael Bernards have been members of the Parks & Recreation Board and their terms expired June 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, Doug Nunnenkamp, Emily Silverman and Michael Bernards have submitted an application for re-appointment; and

WHEREAS, Procedural rules 1.05.190(A)5 states a sitting member of the Board may be reappointed by the Council without an open application process if the member of the Board requests reappointment in writing, and the City Council waives the requirement for an open application process.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORTH PLAINS, OREGON, that Doug Nunnenkamp, Emily Silverman and Michael Bernards are re-appointed to the North Plains Parks & Recreation Board for a two year term expiring June 30, 2023.

CITY OF NORTH PLAINS, OREGON

BY: ________________________________
    Teri Lenahan, Mayor

ATTEST:

BY: ________________________________
    Lori Lesmeister, City Recorder
APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE PARKS BOARD

Information provided in this application is considered public and may be used upon announcing your appointment. The Parks Board usually meets once a month for approximately 1-2 hours. From time to time, special meetings are held to meet deadlines or conduct public hearings. Preparation for each meeting usually involves an equal amount of time. The Parks Board’s regular meetings are the fourth Wednesday of each month at 6:00 p.m.

Each position is a two-year term. If the application is submitted to fill a vacancy, the appointee will serve for the time remaining in that term. Each applicant is interviewed by the Parks Board and the City Council. The Board will relay its recommendation to the City Council for review at the Council’s next scheduled meeting. The Council interview will occur prior to making its appointment to the Board. Plan to attend both meetings for your application consideration.

☐ Resident/business or property owner within City Limits
☐ Resident within 97133 zip code

Name: Douglas R. Nunnenkamp

Date: 06/15/2021

Mailing Address

Street Address if different:

City: Oregon

State: Oregon Zip: 97133

Home Phone: Work Phone: Cell Phone:

E-mail Address:

Occupation:

Please answer the following questions. There is no “right” answer to any question. If additional space is needed, use the back of this page or attach a separate page.

1. Why would you like to serve on the Parks Board?
   - I enjoy giving back to the community that has been such a large part of my families life.
   - I also enjoy the planning process for future Parks, Trails and Recreation.

2. What do you think are the most important park issues now facing North Plains?
   - Planning for new Parks, Trails and Rec.
   - Expanding and Maintaining existing Parks and Trails.
   - Safety!
   - Meeting the Communities needs for all ages.

3. Do you have any special interests or qualifications that you would bring to the Parks Board?
   - Current Planning Commissioner.
   - Current Parks and Recreation Board member.
   - Past Farmers Market board member.

Thank you for applying. Your interest is appreciated!
APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE PARKS BOARD

Information provided in this application is considered public and may be used upon announcing your appointment. The Parks Board usually meets once a month for approximately 1-2 hours. From time to time, special meetings are held to meet deadlines or conduct public hearings. Preparation for each meeting usually involves an equal amount of time. The Parks Board’s regular meetings are the second Monday of each month at 6:00 p.m.

Each position is a two-year term. If the application is submitted to fill a vacancy, the appointee will serve for the time remaining in that term. Each applicant is interviewed by the Parks Board and the City Council. The Board will relay its recommendation to the City Council for review at the Council’s next scheduled meeting. The Council interview will occur prior to making its appointment to the Board. Plan to attend both meetings for your application consideration.

☐ Resident/business or property owner within City Limits

☐ Resident within 97133 zip code

Name: __________________________________________________________________________ Date: ____________

Mailing Address _____________________________________________________________________

Street Address if different: _____________________________________________________________________

City: North Plains

State: OR Zip: 97133

Home Phone: __________________ Work Phone: __________________ Cell Phone: __________________

E-mail Address: _______________________________________________________________________

Occupation: _________________________________________________________________________

Please answer the following questions. There is no “right” answer to any question. If additional space is needed, use the back of this page or attach a separate page.

1. Why would you like to serve on the Parks Board? I have really valued the past two years on the board and I would love to continue to take part in helping to support parks and rec in our community.

2. What do you think are the most important park issues now facing North Plains? renovating and making accessible our current parks; ensuring that there is a variety of activities and spaces available for the variety of residents in NP

3. Do you have any special interests or qualifications that you would bring to the Parks Board? Well, I’ve been on the Parks Board for two years :) I have a background in nonprofit work and planning and community programs.

Thank you for applying. Your interest is appreciated!
APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE PARKS BOARD

Information provided in this application is considered public and may be used upon announcing your appointment. The Parks Board usually meets once a month for approximately 1-2 hours. From time to time, special meetings are held to meet deadlines or conduct public hearings. Preparation for each meeting usually involves an equal amount of time. The Parks Board’s regular meetings are the fourth Wednesday of each month at 6:00 p.m.

Each position is a two-year term. If the application is submitted to fill a vacancy, the appointee will serve for the time remaining in that term. Each applicant is interviewed by the Parks Board and the City Council. The Board will relay its recommendation to the City Council for review at the Council’s next scheduled meeting. The Council interview will occur prior to making its appointment to the Board. Plan to attend both meetings for your application consideration.

☐ Resident/business or property owner within City Limits

☐ Resident within 97133 zip code

Name: Michael Bernardo

Date: 17 June 2021

Mailing Address: 

Street Address if different: 

City: North Plains

State: OR Zip: 97133

Home Phone: Work Phone: Cell Phone: 

E-mail Address: 

Occupation: Agile Coach/Senior Scrum Master

Please answer the following questions. There is no “right” answer to any question. If additional space is needed, use the back of this page or attach a separate page.

1. Why would you like to serve on the Parks Board? Volunteering and community service have always been important values to me which I also consider to be in the Parks Board's DNA. If elected to continue serving, I would be able to keep contributing towards our Master Plan and help create/maintain Parks for our growing city to enjoy.

2. What do you think are the most important park issues now facing North Plains? Ensuring the park remain the recreational fabric that continues to help the community together while accommodating our impending population growth and city expansion.

3. Do you have any special interests or qualifications that you would bring to the Parks Board? Having served on the Board the past 3 years, coupled with serving as President of the Park Foundation, I would be a great contributor and communicator for theto interact and coordinate.

Thank you for applying. Your interest is appreciated!
RESOLUTION NUMBER 2155

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORTH PLAINS, OREGON, APPOINTING TIM SCHALLICH TO THE NORTH PLAINS PUBLIC LIBRARY BOARD

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of North Plains adopted Resolution Number 1089 on April 15, 2002, establishing the North Plains Public Library; and

WHEREAS, Resolution Number 1089 established a Library Board and the terms by which the Library Board members would serve; and

WHEREAS, Municipal Code Chapter 1.25 established a Library Board and the membership, organization, and rules of Library Board members.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORTH PLAINS, OREGON, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Tim Schallich is appointed to the Library Board for a four (4) year term commencing July 1, 2021 and expiring June 30, 2025

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption by the City Council.

INTRODUCED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of June, 2021.

CITY OF NORTH PLAINS, OREGON

BY: _____________________________________
   Teri Lenahan, Mayor

ATTEST:

BY: ______________________________________
   Lori Lesmeister, City Recorder
APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE CITY OF NORTH PLAINS LIBRARY BOARD

Information provided in this application is considered public and may be used in announcing your appointment. Please submit your completed form to the North Plains City Hall, located at 31360 NW Commercial Street, North Plains, OR 97133.

Unless otherwise announced the North Plains Public Library Board meets at 7:00 p.m. on the third Wednesday of the month at the Library (31334 NW Commercial Street). Each position is a four year term; if the application is submitted to fill a vacancy, the appointee will serve for the time remaining in that term. Each applicant is interviewed by the Library Board, which will then make its recommendation to the City Council for review at the Council’s next scheduled meeting. The Council will interview each applicant. Plan to attend this meeting for your application consideration.

Tim Schallich

Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Mailing Address: ___________________________

Street Address: ___________________________

City: ___________________________ State: Oregon Zip: 97133

Contact Phone: ___________________________ E-mail Addresses: ___________________________

Please answer the following questions. There is no “right” answer to any question. If additional space is needed, use the back of this application or attach a separate page.

1. Why would you like to serve on the Library Board?
   I know a library is a very important asset of small communities, and I would like to help guide the North Plains Library into a positive future.

2. What do you think are the most important issues now facing North Plains Library?
   Listening to its patrons to provide them with the services they desire while living within its budget.

3. Do you have any special interests or qualifications that you would bring to the Library Board?
   I served on a small community library board in Myrtle Creek, Oregon for 12 years.

Thank you for applying. Your interest is appreciated.
Date:       June 21, 2021
To:         Mayor and City Council
From:       Library Director, Robin Doughty
Subject:    Monthly Staff Report - Library
## HISTORICAL COMPARISON DATA FY 2012 – 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly door count</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>3,264</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>3,961</td>
<td>3,688</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly circulation</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>5,257</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td>5,074</td>
<td>5,508</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>6,444</td>
<td>5,137</td>
<td>4,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RECENT MONTHS 2020 – 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>997**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Year Door Count</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>4,206</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>4,469</td>
<td>4,572</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>5,070</td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td>4,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Year Circulation</td>
<td>6,765</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>6,805</td>
<td>6,186</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>6,963</td>
<td>6,128</td>
<td>5,359</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


** First month post-COVID back to using 3M gate counter.
E-Content Statistics for WCCLS – May 2021

Total E-Content Circ

Social Media Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Reach</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>2,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Followers</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Interactions</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram Reach</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram Followers</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram Inter.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Indoor Service Expansion
The library is open via the front entrance 10 a.m. – 6 p.m. Mon-Fri & 10 a.m. – 5 p.m. on Sat for all services. Patrons may retrieve their own holds from the holds shelf or request contact free pick-up. Once we staff 6 p.m. – 7 p.m. Mon-Fri, we will be back to pre-COVID hours which we are planning by the end of summer or when we see demand return. As of the week of 6/14/21, we are still requiring masks indoors and are limiting available computers for distancing. We are encouraging short visits to keep occupancy flowing, but have dropped the “two family at a time” rule.

Each Washington County Cooperative Library Services (WCCLS) member library is governed by their local jurisdiction, so reopening looks slightly different at each library.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: YOUTH SERVICES

The 2021 Summer Reading Program, “Reading Colors Your World” is in full swing with 130 books given to kids and teens in the first 2 weeks of the program.

- Library staff are visiting North Plains Elementary virtual classrooms again this year to showcase the program and answer questions. For classes we are not able to visit, we created a video for the teachers to show. Here is the link! https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dMFU-__kzo7s&t=4s
- Storytimes and a Summer edition of Levels 1 and 2 of Letters, Sounds, and Math continue weekly through July.
- Our first off-site Book Giveaway of the summer will be Sat, July 10 12:30 p.m. – 3 p.m. at Jessie Mays Park.

Elementary Super Summer Session: “Explore the Historic Journey of Pie!”
You may know pie as just a dessert served after dinner - but it is so much more! Join us to learn about the historic journey of the hand pie from the Middle East to the Americas. June 30, 5 p.m. – 6 p.m. via Zoom.

Register online for youth classes and events at https://wccls.bibliocommons.com/events

ANNOUNCEMENTS: ADULT SERVICES

African Dance & Music with Habiba
Join Habiba and North Plains Public Library for a joyful and uplifting morning of storytelling, dancing and music. Come, elevate and celebrate one another. All bodies are beautiful, cherished and welcome! Saturday, June 26 at 10 a.m. on the Jessie Mays Park lawn. This program is for adults and teens.

Bookwanderers – A Travel-themed Bookclub
Join North Plains Public Library's new book group to embark on a journey through books! We’ll read fiction and
nonfiction about all manner of voyages, travels, and journeys - and enjoy friendly discussion on the second Saturday of the month at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom.

July 10 – The Geography of Bliss by Eric Weiner
August 14 – The Lost Vintage by Ann Mah

North Plains Public Library Bookclub
Hosted by the Friends of the North Plains Public Library, all are welcome to our monthly bookclub on the last Wednesday of the month. Discuss The Keeper of Lost Things by Ruth Hogan on June 30 at 7 p.m.
July 28 – The Night Watchman by Louise Erdich
August 25 – The Wonder Boy of Whistle Stop by Fannie Flag

Register for bookclubs at https://wccls.bibliocommons.com/events

ANNOUNCEMENTS: UPCOMING MEETINGS

Library Board
The library board meets on the third Wednesday of each month to discuss the library, its goals, and objectives. The next meeting will be held on July 21, 2021 in the library or via Zoom at 7 p.m.
Date: June 21, 2021
To: Honorable Mayor and City Council
From: Police Chief James Haxton
Subject: June 2021 Monthly Staff Report

Calls for service (May 2021): NPPD Officers responded/self-initiated to 190 calls for service. These calls include but are not limited to dispatched calls for service, investigative stops, community contacts, assist person calls and city ordinance violations. May 2021: Several individuals were arrested for theft and trespassing after going onto someone’s property and stealing cans/bottles. No recurring trends in May. Deputies received in-service training which focused on their less lethal tools: Taser, OC, Baton.

(R-Reports/Y2-Warnings/Y3-Citations/TS-Traffic Stop/PD-Public demand/SI-Self initiated)

Contract Deputies Activities (Only NP deputy activities in All of the county)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Plains Calls (All police activities within NP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: June 21, 2021  
To: Mayor and City Council  
From: Public Works Director – Blake Boyles  
Subject: Public Works Staff Report

**Plan/Project/Misc.**

- The new reservoir…Tank construction has been on hold until panels are returned from factory and recoated with the specified glass lining. The new completion date has been moved to November 19, 2021

- Working with 3J on design of a waterline replacement/ upsizing on NW Cottage St. This capital improvement project will be completed prior to street overlay. Area has been flown with drones for design engineering (ON-GOING)

- Drone work has been on-going over most of the city. This work is in coordination with the Pavement Management study and upcoming Capital Improvement Projects.

**New Development**

Brynhill development: Pressure testing and chlorination of water mains continues. All paving within the development has been completed and work on North Ave is to begin shortly. Along with phase 2 which will be north of the current development work.

Bridge construction project is underway, clearing brush and diamond post anchors are being installed, abutments and headwall work in planning. Pedestrian path work on West Union is underway and should be completed by the first week in July. (Area between Sunset Ridge 2 and Stewart Lane)
Working with Wildwood Playgrounds and 3J Engineering on different ideas of trying to raise the play structure at Pacific Park. (ON-GOING)

Working with the design engineer on Jessie Mays new layout. Hard surfaces for basketball and pickle ball courts. Irrigation relocation as well as cyclone fence replacement. Cost estimates are coming in and being reviewed. Design for stormwater detention is being developed (ON-GOING)

Construction of the outdoor bathrooms at Jessie Mays has been put on hold until after the Garlic Festival.

Also during the weekend of June 5-6 Public Works crew member Andrew Heritage went above and beyond to assist TVFR with two fires in an 18hr period. His actions aided the firefighters in extinguishing the trailer fire safely and quickly.

All the while crews fulfilling their daily scheduled duties:

Hanging basket watering
Park Equipment Safety Check
Trash bin and dog waste emptying
Pump and Reservoir check
Water Sampling
Re-reads, Door Hangers, Water Shut-offs
Leak Checks for citizens
Locates
Customer complaints
Sign repair/ installation
Date: June 16, 2021
To: City Council
From: Bill Reid, Finance Director
Subject: Monthly Staff Report - Finance

This memorandum is intended as a snapshot of how City of North Plains operating funds expenditures and revenues compare to allocated budget through May 31, 2021. Here, allocated budget refers to budgeted expenditures for the eleven-month period of July 2020 through May 31 of 2021, or 92% of the 12-month fiscal year.

The City of North Plains has three operating funds:

1. **General Fund (110)**
2. **Streets Fund (111)**
3. **Water Fund (210)**

**General Fund (110) Summary**

General Fund expenditures have been roughly 102% of budgeted through the end of May 2021, but total spending is still under fiscal year budget with one month left in the fiscal year. Materials & Services spending continues to be ahead of budget-to-date, with most expense reflected in the Community Development Department due to project planning professional services. General Fund revenues have generally been notably higher than projected budget. May of 2021 marks the receipt of significant Community Development Department fee revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>To Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>1,778,428</td>
<td>1,630,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>1,144,484</td>
<td>1,049,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>14,851</td>
<td>13,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>1,673,684</td>
<td>1,534,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Revenues</td>
<td>1,073,222</td>
<td>983,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Revenues</td>
<td>600,462</td>
<td>550,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Fund Departments Detail

Department expenses for all but Community Development are looking to end the year at or below budget. Actual revenues to-date for all departments, both restricted and unrestricted, exceed where they should be by end of May and are on pace to exceed total year budget by at least 6%-8%. Community Development Department received over $150,000 in engineering design review fee revenues in May.

### General Government 419

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>358,226</td>
<td>295,170</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>138,625</td>
<td>113,652</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>207,350</td>
<td>169,268</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>12,251</td>
<td>12,251</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>333,422</td>
<td>312,194</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Revenues</td>
<td>313,381</td>
<td>311,487</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Revenues</td>
<td>20,041</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parks & Recreation 452

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>78,834</td>
<td>54,089</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>11,034</td>
<td>6,039</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>67,800</td>
<td>48,050</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>54,760</td>
<td>48,334</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Revenues</td>
<td>48,295</td>
<td>44,270</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Revenues</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Safety 421

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>528,261</td>
<td>455,408</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>354,614</td>
<td>312,549</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>189,647</td>
<td>43,879</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>514,228</td>
<td>497,918</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Revenues</td>
<td>478,657</td>
<td>484,417</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Revenues</td>
<td>35,571</td>
<td>13,502</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Library 455

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>439,349</td>
<td>387,200</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>354,641</td>
<td>312,549</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>82,135</td>
<td>70,631</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>405,630</td>
<td>405,128</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Revenues</td>
<td>332,374</td>
<td>205,347</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Revenues</td>
<td>333,266</td>
<td>205,347</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Development 465

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>373,758</td>
<td>466,189</td>
<td>136%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>114,820</td>
<td>81,151</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>258,938</td>
<td>385,038</td>
<td>162%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>365,644</td>
<td>634,132</td>
<td>189%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Revenues</td>
<td>33,270</td>
<td>33,297</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Revenues</td>
<td>332,374</td>
<td>600,835</td>
<td>197%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Streets Fund (111) Summary

The Streets Fund is still largely on-budget for FY 2021 as May 31. The primary change in May of 2021 was the receipt of $350,000 from Washington County for reserved future maintenance of North Avenue. Transportation package project planning has required consultant expense, though the fuel-tax funded borrowing for projects will reimburse the City for project engineering expenses already incurred. Local Fuel Tax receipts as of May 31 were $42,322.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets - 111</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>512,316</td>
<td>469,623</td>
<td>421,546</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>144,301</td>
<td>132,276</td>
<td>119,815</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>58,650</td>
<td>53,763</td>
<td>92,306</td>
<td>172%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>206,250</td>
<td>175,060</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>54,365</td>
<td>49,835</td>
<td>34,365</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intergovernmental | 337,025 | 308,940 | 321,175 | 104% |
| Other Revenues | 113,650 | 104,179 | 512,748 | 492% |
| Total Revenues | 450,675 | 413,119 | 833,923 | 202% |

Water Fund (210) Summary

The North Plains Water Fund has spent roughly 57% of expected budget through May 31. Water tank capital outlay expenditures have continued at pace, but not as high as budgeted to date. Water user fee revenues are 96% of budget but we continue to expect water fee revenues from households to pick up as weather warms and end the year above budget forecast.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water - 210</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>As % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>5,052,080</td>
<td>4,631,073</td>
<td>2,657,286</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>562,680</td>
<td>515,790</td>
<td>517,251</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>427,400</td>
<td>391,783</td>
<td>371,517</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>3,942,000</td>
<td>3,613,500</td>
<td>1,748,519</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,333</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>91,667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage Fees</td>
<td>1,520,632</td>
<td>1,393,913</td>
<td>1,332,752</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Proceeds</td>
<td>3,880,000</td>
<td>3,556,667</td>
<td>1,619,948</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>19,250</td>
<td>11,432</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>5,421,632</td>
<td>4,969,829</td>
<td>2,964,132</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water Fund Account Status Report

At the end of May 2021, roughly $18,952 in past-due balances were owed by water customers in North Plains. The single-largest aging status of overdue accounts was Balances over 120 days at $8,141.65. Summary of aging account status as of May 31, 2021 is found in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bal Forward</th>
<th>Bal Under 30</th>
<th>Bal 30 to 60</th>
<th>Bal 60 to 90</th>
<th>Bal 90 to 120</th>
<th>Bal Over 120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$63,206.80</td>
<td>$44,255.25</td>
<td>$5,556.84</td>
<td>$2,758.33</td>
<td>$2,494.73</td>
<td>$8,141.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less: CreditsApplied ($18,680.52)

GRAND TOTAL: $44,526.28

OVERDUE BALANCE GRAND TOTAL: $18,951.55

In contrast, as of May 31, 2020 last year not long into the COVID-19 emergency, Balances over 120 days totaled only $1,747.43. The increase of very overdue accounts marks a 466% jump. Balances 90 to 120 were $1,272.55, which has roughly doubled to this year’s mark of almost $2,500.
Other Finance Department Activities

- **City Credit Rating:** Standard & Poor’s gave the City of North Plains a very advantageous AA rating. Maintaining and growing an unspent reserves balance in the General Fund was a key finding during the process and gives staff a directive of continued success in financial management.

- **FY 2020 Audit:** Staff are working on a plan of action for City Council review to address procedural improvements as a result of 2020 Audit findings.

- **FY 2017 Urban Renewal Audit:** Staff are gearing up for an audit of 2017 financials for the urban renewal agency. The process is not expected to be complicated given the relatively few activities the URA took up that year.

- **SDC Methodology Update:** The delayed SDC and TUF methodology update study will continue in earnest soon with the completion of audited FY 2020 financial statements, the complete draft Capital Improvement Plan, and updated population growth numbers as part of the UGB expansion study process.

- **Transportation Package Bond:** On June 17, the City closed on roughly $6 million in Full Faith & Credit borrowings for fuel-tax funded transportation projects. The AA credit rating helped the City get an interest-free borrowing premium equal to roughly 15% of all borrowings issued.

- **GOA:** The RFP for finding and selecting a qualified developer to construct prioritized uses at the Glencoe Opportunity Area was issued June 2. 50 development interests throughout the region were given direct invitation to review and submit on the RFP, which was also published officially in the Portland Daily Journal of Commerce and the Oregonian. An optional pre-proposal meeting was held June 15 where attendance by development interests was larger than anticipated. The RFP response due date stands at Friday July 23 at 4pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT #</th>
<th>RECEIVED</th>
<th>Subproject: LU TYPE/BP/FN/SN/ROW/etc</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION/TYPE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-018</td>
<td>5/10/2021</td>
<td>Lot Line Adjustment</td>
<td>Holm Family Real Estate</td>
<td>Type 1- Lot Line adjustment for vacated pacific St</td>
<td>Northern 30’ of vacated Pacific St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-019</td>
<td>5/17/2021</td>
<td>New Industrial Structure</td>
<td>HD Fowler</td>
<td>Type 1- New Industrial Structure</td>
<td>10875 NW 292nd Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-020</td>
<td>6/3/2021</td>
<td>Temporary Use Permit</td>
<td>Lennar Homes</td>
<td>Type 1- Sales office</td>
<td>Turel Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-021</td>
<td>6/9/2021</td>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td>Hillsboro School District/Security Signs</td>
<td>Type 1- Permanent Sign</td>
<td>29714 NW King St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: June 14, 2021  
To: City Council  
From: Heather Austin, AICP, Consulting Land Use Planner  
Subject: Lennar Appeal- Brynhill Rowhomes Master Plan Refinement

The North Plains Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on May 12, 2021 to consider two land use applications, both filed by Lennar Northwest, Inc. (Lennar) regarding the rowhomes in Phases 1-3 of the Brynhill Master Plan area:

1. City File 21-016 -Design Review for construction of the rowhomes

2. City File 21-017 -Master Plan Refinement to allow an increase in lot coverage for internal rowhome units from 80% (existing maximum in NC zone) to 88% (prior to the public hearing the request was 87%, but the applicant revised the request to account for situations where the lot coverage was 87.4%).

The Planning Commission approved the Design Review application (21-016) and denied the Master Plan Refinement application (21-017).

Lennar, the original applicant and now the property owner, filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s denial of File 21-017, Master Plan Refinement. Lennar does not appeal the approval of the design review application, City File 21-016. The appeal documentation is included in this packet as Exhibit A.

On June 21, 2021, the City Council will conduct a quasi-judicial land use hearing to issue a decision on the appeal.

The original staff report (Exhibit B) includes findings pertinent to the review of a master plan refinement, including Sections 155.261.F.1-3 and 155.261.G.1-2 of the Development Code. These findings reference a lot coverage increase for internal units up to 87%, as the staff report went to print prior to the applicant’s revised request of 88%. However, the staff report findings are applicable to a maximum lot coverage of 87% or 88%.

The Planning Commission denial of City File 21-017 (Notice of Decision) is included in this packet (Exhibit C).

The Development Code criteria applicable to Master Plan Refinement requests include:
155.261 Procedure (Master Plans; Standards and Requirements)

F. In the process of reviewing applications for individual phases within an approved Master Plan, the Commission may approve the refinements to the Master Plan. Refinements to the Master Plan are defined as:

1. Changes to the street network or functional classification of streets that do not significantly reduce circulation system function or connectivity for vehicles, bicycles or pedestrians;

2. Changes to the nature or location of park type, trails or open space that do not significantly reduce land area, function, livability, usability, connectivity or overall distribution or availability of these uses in the Master Plan area; and

3. Changes to the location or mix of land uses, or configuration of individual lots or site plan elements, that do not significantly alter the overall distribution or availability of uses or density in the Master Plan area.

G. Refinements meeting the above definition may be approved by the Commission upon finding that:

1. The refinement(s) will equally or better meet the conditions of the approved Master Plan.

2. The refinement will not preclude an adjoining phase from development consistent with the approved Master Plan.

Council Action
The City Council must render the City’s final decision on this Master Plan Refinement application. The City Council may take one of the two following actions:

1. Uphold the Planning Commission’s decision to deny the master plan refinement request. If the City Council chooses to do this, the Council will be required to make findings as to how the proposed Master Plan Refinement does not satisfy one or more of the applicable criteria identified above; or

2. Overturn the Planning Commission’s decision and approve the Master Plan Refinement, thereby accepting the findings in the staff report dated May 5, 2021 (Exhibit B) and the applicant’s findings (Exhibit D) regarding the applicable criteria.

Exhibits
A- Submitted Appeal Materials
B- Original Staff Report to Planning Commission dated May 5, 2021 (Pages 17-20 pertain to Master Plan Refinement)
C- Planning Commission Notice of Decision dated May 13, 2021
D- Narrative and Plan Sheet 3.1 submitted on March 30, 2021 for City File 21-017
May 25, 2021

VIA EMAIL AND EXPRESS MAIL

Ms. Lori Lesmeister, City Recorder
City of North Plains
North Plains City Hall
31360 NW Commercial Street
North Plains, OR  97133

RE:  Appeal by Lennar Northwest, Inc. (“Lennar”) of Final Decision by North Plains Planning Commission Decision in City File 20-017

Dear Ms. Lesmeister:

This office represents Lennar.  Enclosed with this letter are the following documents:

- a City of North Plains Land Use Application form signed by Lennar, the applicant and property owner; and

- an appeal statement addressing the requirements of North Plains Zoning and Development Ordinance (the “NPZDO”)155.033, “Appeals.”

Lennar provided the appeal fee of $2,400.00 in a check made payable to the City of North Plains received by the City on May 24, 2021.

Lennar’s consultant, Pacific Community Design, will provide stamped envelopes for mailing of the appeal hearing notice to the City before the appeal deadline of May 26, 2021.

Very truly yours,

Michael C. Robinson
MCR:jmhi
Enclosures

cc:  Mr. David Force (via email) (w/enclosures)
     Ms. Stacy Connery (via email) (w/enclosures)
     Mr. Patrick Espinosa (via email) (w/enclosures)
# LAND USE APPLICATION (TYPE 2, 3, or 4)

## Applicant General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td>Lennar Northwest, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>David Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>11807 NE 99th Street, Suite 1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.force@lennar.com">david.force@lennar.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Lennar Northwest, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>11807 NE 99th Street, Suite 1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(951) 712 - 6445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Property Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Brynhill Master Plan, Phases 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Lot ID</td>
<td>Phases 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Area</td>
<td>Phases 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Development Description</td>
<td>Appeal of Planning Commission Decision (see attached letter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fees - Check all that apply (Deposits effective 07/01/18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type II</th>
<th>LU Process</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Type III</th>
<th>LU Process</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Type IV</th>
<th>LU Process</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Design Review</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Conditional Use</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Comp. Plan Amendment</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Partition-No Street Dedication</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Design Review</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Temp. Structure</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Subdivision-Prelim</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please refer to the current fee schedule or municipal code for clarification.*
Information to Include with Your Application

- Application Form
- Fee: The base fee amount is due with the application. Each application is different and costs incurred by the City may vary. Fees will be based on the application and are subject to change.
- Narrative describing the Development Proposal and addressing the Decision Criteria. All applications will be reviewed based on the criteria of Chapter 16 of the North Plains Municipal Code, which is available at www.northplains.org. A sample narrative is also on website.
- Site plans drawn to scale; one hard copy and PDF document (flash drive or email/file share). Plans should show:
  - All property boundaries in which development is occurring
  - All adjacent roads (with names and dimensions)
  - Location and dimensions of all existing and proposed access ways/alleys/driveways
  - Location, number, dimensions, setbacks
  - All easements (including utilities)
  - Location of all existing and proposed fire hydrants
  - Location, size (area), and setbacks of all existing and proposed buildings and structures
  - Location, size (area), and layout of existing and proposed landscaping
  - Location, number and dimensions of existing and proposed parking areas, including handicapped spaces
  - Location, number and dimensions of existing and proposed loading areas
  - Location, number, dimensions, and types of existing and proposed lighting
  - Location, number, dimensions, setbacks, and types of existing and proposed fencing and or/screening
  - Location, number, dimensions, setbacks, and types of existing and proposed mechanical equipment, such as rooftop equipment and transformer boxes. Show any screening of proposed equipment.
  - Delineate flood plains and water courses
  - Significant vegetation
- Neighborhood Meeting or proof of neighborhood meeting (notices for public meetings should be mailed 10 business days before the meeting is scheduled).
- Stamped envelopes with mailing labels attached for all property owners and residents within 250 feet of the subject property or properties. (A list of property owners/site addresses may be obtained from Washington County or a title insurance company.)
- Clean Water Services, Service Provider Letter or determination that letter is not needed from CWS website: https://www.cleanwaterservices.org/documents-forms/pre-screen-form/
- A traffic study for any project generating more than 300 trips per day.
- Other reports related to specific permit types: ☐ flood plain ☐ significant natural resources ☐ historic overlay ☐ title report for land division ☐ Other

After initial review, the City may require additional information.

Additional Information

In order to expedite and complete the processing of this application, the City of North Plains requires that all pertinent material required for review of this application be submitted at the time application is made. If the application is found to be incomplete, review and processing of the application will not begin until the application is made complete.

I certify that the statements made in this application are complete and true to the best of my knowledge. I understand that any false statements may result in denial of this application.

I understand that there may be additional costs of processing this application including, but not limited to, planning, engineering, city attorney and administration. The City will notify the applicant if there will be additional costs.

Date: 5.21.2021 Signature of Applicant:

Date: 5.21.2021 Signature of Property Owner:

FOR OFFICE USE

Received by: ____________________________ Date: ______________

Fee paid: ______________ Receipt No. ______________ Application No. ______
BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF NORTH PLAINS, OREGON

In the Matter of an Appeal by Lennar Northwest, Inc. (“Lennar”) of a Final Decision (the “Decision”) by the North Plains Planning Commission (the “Planning Commission”) Denying a Master Plan Refinement Application (the “Application”) for Brynhill Master Plan (the “Master Plan”) Phases 1-3 to Allow 88% Lot Coverage Where 80% Lot Coverage is Required for 39 Interior Rowhome Lots out of a Total of 71 Rowhome Lots in the Neighborhood Commercial (“NC”) Zoning District.

1. Introduction.

Lennar is appealing the Decision so that it can build two-story homes with two-car garages on 39 interior rowhome lots in Brynhill Master Plan Phases 1-3, which will match the homes on the 32 end rowhome lots (which will continue to meet the 80% lot coverage standard), and which meet the Master Plan Refinement (“Refinement”) approval criteria (Exhibit 1, Applicable North Plains Zoning and Development Ordinance (“NPZDO”) Standards; Exhibit 2, Application for Master Plan Refinement; Exhibit 3, Applicant’s PowerPoint presentation to the Planning Commission).

The extra lot coverage will allow the homes on the interior lots to be slightly larger, to be two stories instead of three stories and to provide additional off-street parking with two-car garages (side by side, not tandem). The interior lot rowhomes will be similar to the exterior lot rowhomes and will also be compatible with Brynhill’s neighboring developments.

The Staff Report recommended approval of the Master Plan Refinement application. Exhibit 4 at pages 19 and 20.

The Applicant appreciates the Planning Commission’s past support of the Master Plan and its work with the Applicant and the public to develop the Master Plan. This appeal does not reflect any disrespect for the Planning Commission or its members’ work on behalf of the public; it simply requests that the City Council approve the Application that will benefit the Master Plan, its future residents and the City by providing the types of homes that people want to live in.

2. Compliance with NPZDO 155.033, “Appeals.”

Appeals must comply with NPZDO 155.033. This section explains why the Appeal meets these requirements.
A. NPZDO 155.033.A.1-3: “Appeals”:

“A decision issued under the procedures of this chapter may be appealed to the Planning Commission or City Council as follows.

(A) **Who may appeal.** The following people may appeal a land use decision:

(1) The applicant or owner of the subject property;
(2) Any person who was entitled to written notice of the decision; and
(3) Any other person who participated in the proceeding by submitting written comments.”

**Response:** Lennar is the applicant and the property owner. When Lennar submitted the application, it did not own the property but it acquired the property on May 4, 2021. Lennar and its representative, Pacific Community Design, appeared in writing and personally before the Planning Commission at its May 12, 2021 public hearing.

B. NPZDO 155.033.B.1-3: “Appeal Filing Procedure”:

“(B) **Appeal filing procedure.**

(1) **Notice of appeal.** A person described in division (A) above may appeal the decision by filing a notice of appeal.
(2) **Time for filing.** A notice of appeal shall be filed with the City Planner or designee within 14 days of the date the notice of decision was mailed.
(3) **Content of notice of appeal.** The notice of appeal shall:

(a) Identify the decision being appealed, including the date of the decision;
(b) Demonstrate that the person filing the notice of appeal has standing to appeal;
(c) Explain the specific issues being raised on appeal; and
(d) Include the filing fee for each appeal.”

**Response:** Lennar filed this Notice of Appeal on May 25, 2021, within 14 days of the date of mailing of the notice of decision on May 13, 2021.

The Decision being appealed is the “**Final Order and Notice of Decision, 21-017, Brynhill Rowhomes Master Plan Refinement: May 12, 2021.**”

Lennar has standing to file the Appeal, as explained above.

Lennar submitted the required Appeal fee of $2,400.00 to the City on May 24, 2021.

The Appeal includes the specific issues being raised on appeal in Section 4.D, below.
C. NPZDO 155.033.C, “Scope of Appeal”:

Response: This section is not applicable.


“(D) Appeal procedures. Quasi-judicial notice, hearing procedures and decision process shall also be used for all appeals under this section.”

Response: The City Council appeal hearing is a quasi-judicial hearing.

E. NPZDO 155.033.E: “Appeals”:

“(E) Appeal to City Council. A decision of the Planning Commission regarding a land use issue or an appeal of a Type II limited land use decision is the final decision of the city unless appealed to City Council. An appeal to City Council is de novo and shall be based on the record before the Planning Commission public hearing and any new evidence or testimony entered into the record before the City Council without substantive changes to the application reviewed by the Planning Commission. The appeal shall follow the same notification and hearing procedures as for the original Planning Commission hearing. The decision of the City Council on an appeal is final and effective on the date it is sent by the city. The City Council’s decision may be appealed to the state’s Land Use Board of Appeals pursuant to ORS 197.805 to 197.860.”

Response: This is an appeal of a Planning Commission decision to the City Council. The scope of the appeal is de novo, including the Planning Commission record and any new evidence and argument submitted to the City Council. The Appeal does not make substantive changes to the Application reviewed by the Planning Commission. The City’s entire file on this Application should be physically before the City Council.

3. Specific Reasons for the Appeal.

A. Introduction.

The Master Plan is a five phase master plan with a variety of dwelling unit types and lot sizes for its 486-504 dwelling units in the NC Zoning District. Some of the Master Plan lots are “front loaded” with driveways to streets, while others, such as the rowhomes, are “rear loaded” lots with driveways to alleys.

The variety of the dwelling unit types and lot sizes appeal to different homebuyers. However, the common denominator for homebuyers of rowhome lots is that they want their homes to feel like a single family home.
Lennar submitted the Refinement so that homes on the 39 smaller interior lots (lot sizes between 1400 and 1500 square feet) can match the homes on the larger 32 exterior (end) lots (lot sizes between 1500 and 1600 square feet) because buyers prefer two-story homes instead of three-story homes and two-car garages instead of one-car garages. While the end rowhome lots can accommodate these homes with 80% lot coverage, the smaller interior rowhome lots require 88% lot coverage. Without approval of the Refinement, the interior rowhome lot dwellings will have to remain smaller. Lennar’s experience shows that home buyers want larger homes with two-car garages that feel like a detached single-family home.

Finally, NPZDO 155.012 defines “impervious surface” to include not just areas under a roof but all “hard surfaces”, such as driveways, sidewalks, patios and pavement, thus reducing the amount of lot coverage available for a home. “Lot Coverage” is defined as impervious surface. Id. While not a unique way among cities of defining “lot coverage,” the more inclusive definition makes meeting the lot coverage standard more challenging and warrants the flexibility allowed for Master Plans by the Refinement approval criteria. The Applicant’s April 21, 2021 Memorandum in Exhibit 2 explains that out of seven other local governments, only one city defines “lot coverage” the same way as does North Plains.

B. Refinement Application and Staff Report to the Planning Commission.

The Application explained the same reasons for the increased lot coverage (less than a 10% increase on just over 50% of the rowhome lots) as does the Appeal. The Application noted that the Master Planner Rudy Kadlub reviewed the proposed interior rowhome lots with 88% lot coverage and concluded that they met the Brynhill Pattern Book. The Application at pages 17-19 addressed the Refinement approval criteria in NPZDO 155.261.F and G.

The Staff Report to the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Refinement. None of the reviewing agencies recommended denial of the Application. The Staff Report at pages 17 and 18 found the Refinement approval criteria in NPZDO 155.261.F and G to be met. Lennar agrees with the three recommended conditions of approval at Staff Report page 20.

C. Planning Commission Decision.

The Planning Commission denied the Application but its final written decision contains no explanation of why it denied the Application; the decision states only that its decision is based on a finding that the 80% maximum lot coverage shall apply to all townhome lots in the Brynhill Master Plan without addressing either NPZDO 155.260, “Master Plans; Standards and Requirements,” or NPZDO 155.261.G.1 and 2, “Refinements.” NPZDO 155.031.H.1and 2, respectively, require that the Planning Commission’s decision be based on the relevant standards and criteria and explain why those standards and criteria are either met or not met, based on the facts of the application. The Decision does not do this.
D. Specific Reasons for the Appeal and Why the City Council can Grant the Appeal.

This section explains why the City Council can grant the appeal and approve the Master Plan refinement to allow 39 interior townhome lots to have 88% lot coverage instead of 80% lot coverage.

a. The Application is consistent with NPZDO 155.260.A, as explained in Exhibit 4-Staff Report to the Planning Commission pages 17-20 Exhibit 1 at page 16.

NPZDO 155.260.A provides:

“(A) The land uses in a Master Plan shall generally reflect the concept plan adopted when an area is brought into the urban growth boundary, or as modified through Master Plan approval. Flexibility in arrangement of uses and densities is permitted provided that the overall Master Plan is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density ranges as identified in the adopted Concept Plan.”

The Master Plan process allows flexibility as long as the land uses remain in substantial compliance with the approved Master Plan Concept Plan. This Application meets that standard because the Master Plan remains in substantial compliance with the approved Master Plan Concept Plan. No additional dwelling units are permitted, density is not increased and the Master Plan will continue to reflect the Master Plan Concept Plan with this change. A Master Plan is not required to strictly adhere to the NC zone’s standards, including lot coverage.


As explained in the Application (Exhibit 2) and in the Staff Report (Exhibit 4), the Application is an appropriate refinement to the Master Plan under NPZDO 155.261.F.3.

The Application also meets the two approval criteria for a Refinement in NPZDO 155.261.G.1 and 2.

First, and consistent with the allowance of flexibility for master plans, the refinement is equal to and better meets the conditions of the Master Plan for these reasons:

- it allows houses to be two-stories rather than three-stories and to have two-car garages rather than one-car garages. This allows the interior rowhome lots to match the exterior rowhome lots, to have more off-street parking, which appeals to more homebuyers, especially those that do not want a three-story home;
- it does not increase vehicle trips or impact utilities;
- it does not allow more dwelling units or increase the Master Plan density;
- even though each interior rowhome’s lot yard area will be reduced by about 9%,
  the Master Plan has 7.18 acres of public and private open space, some of which is
  near the rowhomes. \textbf{Exhibit 3}, PowerPoint slide 2; and
- the Master Plan remains internally consistent and compatible with its adjacent
  residential land uses.

Second, the Application does not preclude an adjoining phase from developing consistently
with the Master Plan.

The City Council can find that the approval criteria for a refinement based in the relevant
facts are satisfied.

4. \textbf{Conclusion.}

Lennar appreciates the City Council’s consideration of its request that it be allowed to
increase the lot coverage for interior row homes so that those homes can better meet what
homebuyers want and that will continue to reflect the Master Plan Concept Plan by applying
the flexibility allowed for master plans in the NC zoning district.

Lennar respectfully requests that the City Council grant the appeal and approve the
Application to allow 88% lot coverage on 39 interior rowhome lots.
EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1  NPZDO 155.260 and 155.261, relevant approval standards

Exhibit 2  Application pages 14-19, the April 21, 2021 memorandum comparing the City’s standards for impervious surfaces and lot coverage to other cities’ and counties’ requirements and the May 7, 2021 memorandum amending the Application to request 88% lot coverage instead of 87% lot coverage

Exhibit 3  Applicant’s PowerPoint presentation to the Planning Commission

Exhibit 4  Staff Report to the Planning Commission pages 17-20
The following standards and requirements shall govern the application for Master Plan approval within the NC Zone.

(A) The land uses in a Master Plan shall generally reflect the concept plan adopted when an area is brought into the urban growth boundary, or as modified through Master Plan approval. Flexibility in arrangement of uses and densities is permitted provided that the overall Master Plan is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density ranges as identified in the adopted Concept Plan.

(B) A Master Plan application may address the entirety of any expansion area individually or may combine expansion areas within the urban growth boundary (UGB).

(C) A phasing plan shall be included with the submitted Master Plan for any expansion area. The phasing plan shall indicate the acreage of each proposed phase to be developed, the number of housing units and square footage of other development projected within the phase and the approximate timing of the construction of each phase. The phasing plan shall provide a reasonable sequence of development for the expansion area with regards to the transportation system, utilities and topography of the area as well as market conditions and development within the city as a whole. The Planning Commission shall approve the phasing plan as part of the Master Plan. Revisions to the phasing plan after Master Plan approval are permitted as reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

(D) Master plans shall have public spaces, such as a plaza, park, school or community square.

(E) Garages, carports and accessory structures shall be accessed from the rear of the building via an alley where appropriate and feasible. If front access garages are proposed, the applicant must provide justification as to why rear access garages are not appropriate or feasible. A garage, carport, accessory dwelling or accessory structure shall not extend beyond the front building elevation of the principle structure by more than six feet.

(F) A minimum of 10% of the single-family detached housing units proposed with a Master Plan shall be single-level construction, or as modified through the Master Plan review process.

(G) Commercial buildings shall be designed to front on pedestrian-friendly streets rather than parking lots or arterial roadways.

(Prior Code, § 16.045.030) (Ord. 430, passed 10-3-2016; Ord. 451, passed 6-4-2018; Ord. 467, passed 1-21-2020)
§ 155.261 PROCEDURE.

The following procedure shall be observed when a Master Plan proposal is submitted for consideration.

(A) The applicant shall submit one copy of a Master Plan application with all exhibits and one electronic copy of all submittal materials to the city for review. The Master Plan submittal shall include the following information in graphic and written form:

1. Proposed land uses and housing unit densities;
2. Tables detailing the dimensional, area and setback requirements for each of the proposed use categories;
3. Proposed access and circulation;
4. Proposed open space uses;
5. Preliminary grading and drainage pattern;
6. Preliminary utility plan for sanitary sewer and water;
7. Relation of the proposed Master Plan to the surrounding area and the Comprehensive Plan; and
8. Phasing schedule identifying anticipated sequence and timing of each phase or phases.

(B) Public notice of the proposed Master Plan shall be provided in accordance with the public notice provision of this chapter.

(C) In considering the Master Plan, the Commission shall determine whether:

1. The minimum residential density of the north and east non-exception expansion areas, as included within the city limits prior to 12-31-2017, shall be 8.4 units per net acre. The density of the north expansion area is calculated independently of the east expansion area, and vice versa. If an applicant is seeking Master Plan approval for either the east or north expansion area, the applicant must demonstrate that the single Master Plan achieves a minimum 8.4 residential units per net acre in that entire expansion area. The residential portion of any mixed-use development shall be included in the overall density calculation of the expansion area;

2. (a) In all expansion areas brought into the city limits, the residential development shall be split as follows, or as modified through Master Plan approval:
   1. Single-family detached: 70%; and
   2. Mix of single-family attached and multi-family: 30%.

   (b) The following deviation to this residential split standard is permitted to accommodate flexibility in land development:
      1. A Master Plan proposing 50 or more dwelling units: 2% deviation; and
      2. A Master Plan proposing 49 or fewer dwelling units: 10% deviation.

3. Proposed utility and drainage facilities are adequate for the population densities and type of development proposed; or

4. The proposed circulation system (including proposed street sections) is adequate to support the anticipated traffic and the development will not exceed the adopted functional/performance standard of the streets outside the boundaries of the Master Plan. No roadway straight line tangent
shall exceed 600 feet in length, except where deemed necessary by the Planning Commission due to issues such as: topographic constraints; existing developed conditions; existing property boundaries; or Master Plan design features. Where such an exception is allowed, roundabouts or curb extensions at intersections and other traffic-calming measures shall be evaluated.

(D) If, the Planning Commission finds that the provisions of §§ 155.610 through 155.614 of this chapter are satisfied, the proposal shall be approved. If the Commission finds the provisions are not satisfied, it may deny the application or return the plan to the applicant for revision. In addition to the requirements of this section, the Commission may attach conditions it finds are necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

(E) Applications for individual phases within the Master Plan, such as subdivision or design review applications, may be applied for concurrently with or subsequent to Master Plan approval. If applications for individual phases are applied for concurrently with the Master Plan, the applicant shall extend, in writing, the state-mandated 120-day review period by 30 days for the individual phase application. The Planning Commission will review the Master Plan first and will review the individual phase application at a subsequent Planning Commission meeting. If the Planning Commission requires a second meeting to complete review of the Master Plan, the applicant agrees to an additional 30-day extension to the review period. Applications for individual phases within the Master Plan shall be reviewed under the provisions and requirements of this chapter.

(F) In the process of reviewing applications for individual phases within an approved Master Plan, the Commission may approve the refinements to the Master Plan. Refinements to the Master Plan are defined as:

1. Changes to the street network or functional classification of streets that do not significantly reduce circulation system function or connectivity for vehicles, bicycles or pedestrians;

2. Changes to the nature or location of park type, trails or open space that do not significantly reduce land area, function, livability, usability, connectivity or overall distribution or availability of these uses in the Master Plan area; and

3. Changes to the location or mix of land uses or configuration of individual lots or site plan elements, that do not significantly alter the overall distribution or availability of uses or density in the Master Plan area.

(G) (1) Refinements meeting the above definition may be approved by the Commission upon finding that:

a. The refinement(s) will equally or better meet the conditions of the approved Master Plan; and

b. The refinement will not preclude an adjoining phase from development consistent with the approved Master Plan.

(2) Significant changes to an approved Master Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for processing as an amendment to an approved Master Plan. Significant changes would be defined as any change not covered by divisions (F)(1) through (F)(3) above.

(Prior Code, § 16.045.040) (Ord. 430, passed 10-3-2016; Ord. 451, passed 6-4-2018; Ord. 467, passed 1-21-2020)
Response: The Brynhill Master Plan set aside 4.89 acres of municipal park space; 4.66 acres for the 508 dwelling units and 0.23 acres for the 2-acre mixed-use site. Compliance with this standard was shown at the time of preliminary subdivision application. The proposed rowhome design review and its associated master plan refinement do not alter compliance with this standard.

(2) In order to promote a variety of housing types and efficient land use, a minimum of 30% of the proposed residential development in a Master Plan shall be either attached single-family or multi-family housing. If a Master Plan includes a minimum of 20% of the total proposed housing as multi-family residential, a 20% increase in density will be permitted to the multi-family housing proposed.

Response: The Brynhill Master Plan was required by the NC zone to have 8.4 units per net acre, as well as a residential mix of single-family attached (30 percent) and detached housing (70 percent). As specified in the standard above, the 30 percent may be either attached single-family or multi-family housing. The NC zone also required the Master Plan to reserve 2 acres of land for mixed-use development options. The NC zone allows for a 2-percent deviation—either up or down—for the 30/70 percent residential mix requirement. The Master Plan utilized this 2-percent deviation to provide a potential range of units at the reserved mixed-use area.

Table 1 shows the minimum density for multi-family results in a residential split of 28 percent attached units and 72 percent detached units. The maximum allowable density for multi-family would result in 31 percent attached units and 69 percent detached units.

The approved preliminary subdivision for Phase 2 & 3 included Master Plan Refinement to widen the rowhome products, allowing for two-story (as opposed to three-story) units with attached two-car garages. This application requests an additional refinement to allow interior rowhomes to exceed the 80 percent maximum lot coverage that applies to rowhomes (townhomes) in the NC zone. This refinement does not alter the development’s compliance with the minimum 8.4 units per net acre density and 70/30 mix utilizing the 2-percent deviation.

Table 1 Net Density and Density Mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Minimum (MF)</th>
<th>Maximum (MF)</th>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowhome Attached</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units/Net Acre (57.864)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The original approved Master Plan contained a range of 26-48 multi-family units and a maximum of 508 units overall.

(B) Development within the NC District shall comply with the standards for lot size and dimensional requirements, lot coverage, building height and setbacks as contained within Table NC-1: Development Standards, or as modified and approved during the Master Plan process. Builders and developers are encouraged to create dwellings that meet contemporary lifestyles.
Response: With the proposed refinement, the rowhomes comply with the development standards in Table NC-1. None of the proposed rowhomes exceed three (3) stories in height. Each lot has a minimum 20 feet width and exceeds the lot depth of 50 feet. There is no minimum lot size required.

The Site Plan demonstrates the proposed rowhome lots meet the setback standards of the Table NC-1. (Note: Lots 296 and 297 have a porch eave that extends less than 1 foot beyond the 6-foot front porch setback as allowable per Chapter 155.530 (Projections from Buildings) “Cornices, eaves, canopies, sunshades, gutters, chimneys, flues and other similar architectural features may project not more than two feet into a required yard or into required open space as established by coverage standards.” Since the projection is less than 2 feet, these lots (296-297) comply with the setback standards).

While refining plans for this design review application, it became apparent that interior rowhomes on the smaller lots (1,300-1,310 square feet) would exceed the 80 percent maximum lot standard (see the Site Plan on Exhibit C, which details a typical interior unit with 87 percent lot coverage). Therefore, the applicant is requesting a master plan refinement to allow interior units to exceed the maximum lot coverage standard by 7 percent (a less than 10 percent deviation). This refinement will allow the rowhomes to be more accessible for families looking to buy in this community, providing for a range of housing options within Brynhill that are also compatible with the size and style of homes within North Plains.
(C) Development within the NC District shall provide off-street vehicular and bicycle parking per § 155.676 of this chapter, or as modified and approved during the Master Plan process.
Response: The development complies with off-street vehicular and bicycle parking requirements addressed in NPDC Chapter 155.676 within the following sections of this report.

(D) In the NC Zoning District, a minimum of two acres shall be reserved from exclusive residential development so that commercial, institutional and/or mixed-use development options are available. This reserved area shall be included in one of the development phases proposed with the Master Plan. If development has not occurred in this reserved area for a minimum of five years from the issuance of the final occupancy permit of the final residential unit in the same development phase as the reserved area, then the applicant may submit an application for subdivision or design review to the city for exclusive residential development, with the Planning Commission as the review and decision authority. The reserved area can be used as temporary open space in the interim.
Response: The approved Master Plan reserved 2.02 acres within Phase 1 identified for mixed-use development and a range of 26-48 multi-family units. The approved Phase 2 & 3 Master Plan Refinement adjusted the density range to 30-48 multi-family units. The future mixed-use area is subject to subsequent review of a design review application, which will determine the actual amount of commercial space, number of residential units, and amount of off-street parking to be provided. This design review/master plan refinement application has no impact on the project’s compliance with this standard.

155.260 MASTER PLANS; STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.
The following standards and requirements shall govern the application for Master Plan approval within the NC Zone.
(A) The land uses in a Master Plan shall generally reflect the concept plan adopted when an area is brought into the urban growth boundary, or as modified through Master Plan approval. Flexibility in arrangement of uses and densities is permitted provided that the overall Master Plan is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density ranges as identified in the adopted Concept Plan.
Response: The approved Brynhill Master Plan demonstrated it is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density ranges identified by the adopted Concept Plan. This application proposes a rowhome design review with a few master plan refinements, detailed further in the subsequent section. Modifications are allowed under NPDC Chapter 155.259, which states that the land uses “shall generally reflect the concept plan... or as modified through Master Plan approval. Flexibility in arrangement of uses and densities is permitted provided that the overall Master Plan is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density ranges... in the adopted Concept Plan.”

The rowhomes in this design review application, which were approved with the preliminary subdivision applications for Phases 1-3 will contribute to the overall density goal of 8.4 units per net acre for the Master Plan as a whole (i.e., all phases) and therefore is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density range.

(B) A Master Plan application may address the entirety of any expansion area individually or may combine expansion areas within the urban growth boundary (UGB).
Response: The Brynhill Master Plan application addressed the entire North Expansion Area, which is within the UGB. This application is to develop rowhomes in Phases 1-3 of the Master Plan area.

(C) A phasing plan shall be included with the submitted Master Plan for any expansion area. The phasing plan shall indicate the acreage of each proposed phase to be developed, the number of housing units and square footage of other development projected within the phase and the approximate timing of the construction of each phase. The phasing plan shall provide a reasonable sequence of development for the expansion area with regards to the transportation system, utilities and topography of the area as well as market conditions and development within the city as a whole. The Planning Commission shall approve the phasing plan as part of the Master Plan. Revisions to the phasing plan after Master Plan approval are permitted as reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

Response: Phases were reviewed and approved with the preliminary subdivision and master plan refinement applications for Brynhill Phases 1-3. This design review and master plan refinement application is specific to rowhomes and does not request any changes to phasing.

(D) Master plans shall have public spaces, such as a plaza, park, school or community square.

Response: The Brynhill Master Plan is approved for 5.21 acres of public parks and trails located throughout the site. This design review and master plan refinement application is specific to rowhomes and does not request any changes to public spaces.

(E) Garages, carports and accessory structures shall be accessed from the rear of the building via an alley where appropriate and feasible. If front access garages are proposed, the applicant must provide justification as to why rear access garages are not appropriate or feasible. A garage, carport, accessory dwelling or accessory structure shall not extend beyond the front building elevation of the principle structure by more than six feet.

Response: This design review and master plan refinement application is specific to rowhomes and does not request any changes to garages, carports, or accessory structures as approved with prior applications.

(F) A minimum of 10% of the single-family detached housing units proposed with a Master Plan shall be single-level construction, or as modified through the Master Plan review process.

Response: This design review and master plan refinement application is specific to rowhomes and does not request any changes to the single-level homes in Brynhill Phases 1-3.

(G) Commercial buildings shall be designed to front on pedestrian-friendly streets rather than parking lots or arterial roadways.

Response: The Phase 1 Preliminary Subdivision reserved 2.02 acres, which is designated for commercial/mixed-use development. This commercial area is beyond the boundary of this application, so it is not part of the design review and master plan refinement proposal. The area will be subject to a subsequent design review application.

155.261 PROCEDURE.
The following procedure shall be observed when a Master Plan proposal is submitted for consideration.
F. In the process of reviewing applications for individual phases within an approved Master Plan, the Commission may approve the refinements to the Master Plan. Refinements to the Master Plan are defined as:

1. Changes to the street network or functional classification of streets that do not significantly reduce circulation system function or connectivity for vehicles, bicycles or pedestrians.
   
   **Response:** The applicant does not request any master plan refinements to change the street network or functional classification of streets.

2. Changes to the nature or location of park type, trails, or open space that do not significantly reduce land area, function, livability, usability, connectivity, or overall distribution or availability of these uses in the Master Plan area.
   
   **Response:** The applicant does not request any master plan refinements to change the nature or location of park type, trails, or open space.

3. Changes to the location or mix of land uses, or configuration of individual lots or site plan elements, that do not significantly alter the overall distribution or availability of uses or density in the Master Plan area.
   
   **Response:** The applicant requests a master plan refinement to allow the interior rowhome units to allow them to exceed the maximum 80 percent lot coverage required for rowhomes (townhomes) in the NC zone. As detailed on typical lot plan (Site Plan Exhibit C), the smallest interior lots exceed the standard by 7%, with 87 percent lot coverage. Therefore, the applicant requests a 7 percent deviation (less than 10 percent of the standard) to support the proposed interior rowhome units. The plan remains in compliance with the density requirement for 8.4 units per net acre and the 70/30 detached versus attached housing mix.

G. Refinements meeting the above definition may be approved by the Commission upon finding that:

1. The refinement(s) will equally or better meet the conditions of the approved Master Plan.

   **Response:** The proposed Master Plan Refinement (allow interior rowhome lots to have 87% lot coverage) meets or improves upon the conditions of the approved Master Plan:

   - **Changes to the street network or functional classification of streets**
     
     This application does not propose changes to the street network or functional classification of streets.

   - **Changes to the nature or location of park type, trails, or open space**
     
     This application does not propose changes to the location of park type, trails, or open space.

   - **Changes to the location or mix of land uses**
     
     Allowing a 7 percent increase in the maximum lot coverage standard improves the Master Plan by allowing interior rowhomes that are compatible with the surrounding area (2-story homes that have 3-bedrooms and two-car garages). These are features typically reserved only for end units. This refinement will allow all proposed rowhome units (interior and end units) to be more marketable for families looking to buy in this community. This type of rowhome design is compatible with the size and style of homes
in North Plains, but still provides for a diversity in home options within the Brynhill community that is consistent with the goals of the Master Plan. This refinement to allow 87% lot coverage for interior row home lots has no impact on the location or mix of land uses in the project.

2. The refinement will not preclude an adjoining phase from development consistent with the approved Master Plan.

Response: The refinement, as described above, does not request changes to street network, reductions to municipal park space, or changes to density that would preclude an adjoining phase from development consistent with the approved Master Plan.

Significant changes to an approved Master Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for processing as an amendment to an approved Master Plan. Significant changes would be defined as any change not covered by Subsection F (1-3) above.

Response: The refinement described above is not significant, it represents a less than 10 percent deviation from the standard and will equally meet the conditions of the Master Plan.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 21, 2021

TO: Heather Austin, City of North Plains

FROM: Eric Hawkinson, Pacific Community Design

CC: David Force, Lennar

RE: Brynhill Rowhome Design Review & Master Plan Refinement

This memo is submitted on behalf of the applicant to supplement the requested master plan refinement to allow interior rowhome units to exceed the 80 percent maximum lot coverage standard in the Neighborhood Community (NC) zone.

The definition of lot coverage in the North Plains Municipal Code is as follows (Section 155.012):

LOT COVERAGE. The portion of a lot or parcel covered by impervious surfaces, buildings and structures usually expressed in percentage of total square feet of lot size.

We conducted an inventory of the definition of lot coverage and the lot coverage standard for row homes in the jurisdictions that we frequently work within. This memo provides a summary of this inventory and analysis in support of the request.

Table 1 Lot Coverage Definition in Comparable Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Lot Coverage Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonville</td>
<td>The area of a lot covered by all of the buildings on that lot, expressed as a percentage of the total lot area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>The percentage of lot area covered by the horizontal projection of all structures, buildings, and other impervious surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>That percentage of the total lot area covered by buildings, including covered parking areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>That portion of the lot area which is covered by buildings taller than 24 inches above native grade, as illustrated in Figure 12.01.500-D. Lot coverage is expressed as a percentage of lot area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Grove</td>
<td>The percent of a lot area covered by the horizontal projection of any structures or buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Valley</td>
<td>The portion of a lot that is covered by buildings, and decks, stairways and entry bridges that are more than thirty (30) inches above grade. Eaves are not included in building coverage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the seven (7) jurisdictions listed in Table 1, it’s notable that only one (1) of these jurisdictions (Tigard) include impervious surfaces in the definition of lot coverage.

Table 2 Maximum Lot Coverage Requirement (in Zones Allowing Rowhomes) in Comparable Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Max Rowhome Lot Coverage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonville</td>
<td>Not required for lots &lt; 8,000 sf; otherwise 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>Does not apply to townhouse lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Grove</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Valley</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the seven (7) jurisdictions listed in Table 2, five (5) of them do not have a maximum lot coverage standard for rowhomes (Wilsonville - Villebois, Washington County, Beaverton, Hillsboro, and Forest Grove). The 75% standard shown for Happy Valley is mitigated by the fact that the lot coverage definition does not include impervious surfaces and specifically excludes eaves. The City of Tigard’s standard and definition are consistent with North Plains. However, the City of Tigard has a Planned Unit Development process that allows the applicant to request modification of development standards such as lot coverage.

Given that the definition of lot coverage in North Plains includes impervious surfaces, the applicant respectfully requests the ability to modify the lot coverage standard for rowhomes from 80% to 87%. This will encourage the interior rowhomes to have garage parking, which helps to preserve street frontages for visitor parking. The request is the minimum necessary to implement the plan and will have negligible impact on neighboring properties or the site itself.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 7, 2021

TO: North Plains Planning Commission c/o Lori Lesmeister

FROM: Stacy Connery, Pacific Community Design

CC: Heather Austin, City of North Plains
    David Force, Lennar

RE: Update to Master Plan Refinement request for Brynhill Rowhomes

This memo is submitted on behalf of the applicant to update the requested Master Plan Refinement modifying lot coverage of interior Rowhomes to 88% (original request was 87%).

As we were working on preparations for the Planning Commission hearing, we found some rounding errors were made with the original request of 87%. Our interior Rowhome lots are achieving lot coverage percentages that range from 81.8% to 87.4%. Thus, we request the lot coverage percentage for interior Rowhomes be allowed to be up to 88% percent.

In relation to this request, please also refer to our April 21st Memo (copy enclosed for ease of reference) that provides an analysis of the definition of lot coverage and lot coverage standards for rowhomes in other jurisdictions that we frequently work within. The following paragraph is a reiteration the conclusionary paragraph of our April 21st Memo with an update to the requested percentage.

Given that the definition of lot coverage in North Plains includes impervious surfaces, the applicant respectfully requests the ability to modify the lot coverage standard for rowhomes from 80% to 88%. This will encourage the interior rowhomes to have garage parking, which helps to preserve street frontages for visitor parking. The request is the minimum necessary to implement the plan and will have negligible impact on neighboring properties or the site itself.
North Plains Planning Commission Hearing – May 12, 2021

Brynhill Phase 1-3
Rowhome Design Review &
Master Plan Refinement
Brynhill Phase 1-3 Rowhome Plan
Contact Information

PCD Office: 503.941.9484
Stacy Connery
stacy@pacific-community.com

Patrick Espinosa
patrick@pacific-community.com

Lennar:
David Force, Director of Land Development
David.force@lennar.com
COMPLIANCE WITH CITY OF NORTH PLAINS MUNICIPAL CODE

APPLICABLE REVIEW CRITERIA:
- NC Neighborhood Community Zone

NC NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY ZONE
Master Plans; Standards and Requirements

155.261 Procedure
F. In the process of reviewing applications for individual phases within an approved Master Plan, the Commission may approve the refinements to the Master Plan. Refinements to the Master Plan are defined as:

1. Changes to the street network or functional classification of streets that do not significantly reduce circulation system function or connectivity for vehicles, bicycles or pedestrians;

2. Changes to the nature or location of park type, trails or open space that do not significantly reduce land area, function, livability, usability, connectivity or overall distribution or availability of these uses in the Master Plan area; and

Finding: The proposed refinement does not include changes to the street network or functional classification of streets, or to the nature or location of park types, trails or open space. This standard is met.

3. Changes to the location or mix of land uses, or configuration of individual lots or site plan elements, that do not significantly alter the overall distribution or availability of uses or density in the Master Plan area.

Finding: The proposed refinement to allow a maximum of 87% lot coverage (instead of the NC zone maximum of 80%) on interior, small-lot rowhomes constitutes a change to the configuration of individual lots or site plan elements that do not significantly alter the overall distribution or availability of uses or density in the Master Plan area. This standard is met.

G. Refinements meeting the above definition may be approved by the Commission upon finding that:

1. The refinement(s) will equally or better meet the conditions of the approved Master Plan.
**Finding:** Allowing a 7 percent increase in the maximum lot coverage standard improves the Master Plan by allowing interior rowhomes that are compatible with the surrounding area (2-story homes that have 3-bedrooms and two-car garages). These are features typically reserved only for end units. This refinement will allow all proposed rowhome units (interior and end units) to be more marketable for families looking to buy in this community. This type of rowhome design is compatible with the size and style of homes in North Plains, but still provides for a diversity in home options within the Brynhill community that is consistent with the goals of the Master Plan. This refinement to allow 87% lot coverage for interior rowhome lots has no impact on the location or mix of land uses in the project. This standard is met.

2. The refinement will not preclude an adjoining phase from development consistent with the approved Master Plan.

**Finding:** The refinement to permit an increased maximum lot coverage for internal rowhome units will not preclude adjoining phases from development consistent with the approved master plan. The refinement will, however, apply to future rowhomes proposed in subsequent phases of the Brynhill Master Plan. This standard is met.
CONCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

DESIGN REVIEW, CITY FILE 21-016
The Planning Commission is considering approval of the **Type III Design Review** for construction of 71 rowhomes within phases 1-3 of the Brynhill Master Plan (City File Number 21-016).

Staff recommends approval of the design review application with the following conditions, and the conditions labeled “ongoing and general conditions”, below.

1. Submit to the City of North Plains a Type 1 Residential Building Permit Application with plot plan, elevation and required fee for each rowhome unit. The City will review all building permit applications prior to Washington County building permit review.

2. Maintenance agreements for the private alleys shall be recorded with the final subdivision plats for each subdivision phase.

3. With the exception of model homes approved based on the criteria of Development Code §155.092 (Temporary Uses), underlying subdivision plats must be recorded prior to building permit issuance for any rowhome.

4. In compliance with Development Code §155.010, the design review approval is void after one year unless substantial construction has taken place or the proposed use has occurred. Substantial construction means at least one rowhome cluster has received a building permit and is under construction. The Planning Commission may grant a one-year extension to the approval if the applicant files an extension request on or before the expiration date of the site plan approval.

MASTER PLAN REFINEMENT, CITY FILE 21-017
The Planning Commission is considering approval of a **Master Plan Refinement** to permit a maximum lot coverage of 87% for all interior rowhomes in the Brynhill Master Plan area, including Phases 1-3 and future development phases (City File Number 21-017).

Staff recommends approval of the application with the conditions labeled “ongoing and general conditions”, below.
ONGOING AND GENERAL CONDITIONS
(APPLICABLE TO THE DESIGN REVIEW AND THE MASTER PLAN REFINEMENT)

1. The Master Plan Development Agreement (December 31, 2019) agreed to between the City and the property owners, as well as all subsequent development agreements, shall remain in effect until and unless amended by the signatory parties.

1. The Conditions of approval of the following City Files continue to be in effect on this site: 19-061 (Brynhill Master Plan), 20-014 (Brynhill Subdivision Phase 1 and Master Plan Refinement) and 20-046 and 20-047 (Brynhill Subdivision Phase 2 [Phases 2 and 3] and Master Plan Refinement).

2. The Inadvertent Discovery Plan on this site shall remain in place through the duration of the site development. If remains are found, all work must stop and follow the plan. All archeological laws continue to apply.
STAFF REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

City File Numbers 21-016 and 21-017

Brynhill Rowhomes
Design Review and Master Plan Refinement

Staff Report Date: May 5, 2021

From: Heather Austin, AICP, Consulting Land Use Planner

Application Purpose: This application requests approval of Type III Design Review (21-016) and Type III Master Plan Refinement (21-017) for the rowhomes in Phases 1 through 3 of the Brynhill Master Plan. The design review approval is required prior to building permit issuance for the rowhome units. The master plan refinement is proposed to allow a maximum lot coverage of 87% for internal rowhome units (the NC zone standard for rowhomes is 80%).

Public Hearing Date: May 12, 2021

Owners:

Paine Tract, LLC
10305 SW Park Way, Suite 204
Portland, OR 97225
Contact: Wayne Rembold

Lone Oak Land, LLC
34059 NW Mountaindale Rd.
North Plains, OR 97133
Contact: Susan C. Cropp

Applicant: Lennar
11807 NE 99th Street, Suite 1170
Vancouver, WA 98682
Contact: David Force

Applicant’s representatives: Pacific Community Design, Inc.
12564 SW Main Street
Tigard, OR 97223
Contact: Stacy Connery, AICP or Patrick Espinosa, PE
Site Location: North of NW North Avenue and west of NW 309th Avenue

Tax Lots: Tax Map 1N301, Lots 600, 800, 900 and 1000

Size: 50.4 acres

City Land Use Classification: Neighborhood Community (NC)

Pre-Application Meeting Date: March 12, 2021
Neighborhood Meeting Date: March 18, 2021
Application Submitted: March 30, 2021
Application Deemed Complete: April 13, 2021
Public Notice mailed: April 22, 2021
Public Notice Published: May 6, 2021
120-Day Deadline: August 11, 2021

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

The City accepts many of the Applicant’s findings. Areas where information was missing from the Applicant’s submittal or inconsistent with code criteria have been addressed with a recommended condition of approval of the design review or master plan refinement application.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The property is located north of NW North Avenue and west of NW 309th, within the previously approved Brynhill Master Plan and Subdivisions. The property is zoned NC, Neighborhood Community. The site is 50.4 acres in size. The master plan was approved in August 2019 and refined in May 2020 and February 2021. Phase 1 Subdivision was approved in May 2020. Phase 2 (which was divided into two sub-phases and thus became known as Phases 2 and 3) was approved in February 2021. The site is under construction with infrastructure and housing per the previous Brynhill approvals.

REQUEST

The Applicant requests approval of a Type III Design Review and Type III Master Plan Refinement for the 71 proposed rowhomes in Phases 1-3 of the Brynhill Master Plan area. The rowhomes are proposed in 4-unit and 5-unit groupings, located along NW North Avenue and on three sides of the municipal park. The Master Plan Refinement is to allow some of the interior rowhomes within the Brynhill Master Plan to exceed the 80% maximum lot coverage specified in the NC zoning district. The maximum lot coverage of all interior rowhomes will be 87% as proposed. The maximum lot coverage of all end-unit rowhomes is 80%.
AGENCY COMMENTS

Clean Water Services (CWS): Jackie Sue Humphreys provided a memo dated April 22, 2021 that states, “Clean Water Services has no concerns or objections to this application request. As submitted, this application request will not require further review and all previous conditions shall continue to apply.”

COMPLIANCE WITH CITY OF NORTH PLAINS MUNICIPAL CODE

I. APPLICABLE REVIEW CRITERIA FROM THE NORTH PLAINS ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE:

- Application Requirements and Review Procedures
- Design Review
- NC Neighborhood Community Zone
- Duplex, Triplex and Attached Two Single-Family Dwellings
- Public Facility and Service Requirements
- Off Street Parking and Loading

II. ZONING CODE REVIEW & FINDINGS

Below are applicable citations/review criteria from the North Plains Zoning Ordinance and findings in response to the criteria. Unless discussed below, the applicant has met the requirements of the applicable review criteria fully, and/or the Code’s criteria are not applicable to this proposal and therefore do not warrant discussion.

For ease of review, the findings and conditions are presented separately for the Type III Design Review request (21-016) and the Type III Master Plan Refinement request (21-017).

DESIGN REVIEW, CITY FILE 21-016

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES
155.025 List of Types of Review Procedures

C. Type III Quasi-Judicial Permits by Planning Commission

Finding: This application is classified as Type III because it includes a design review and a master plan refinement. This standard is met.

155.026 Pre-application Conference
(A) A pre-application conference is recommended for Type II and required for Type III and IV permits. The City Manager may waive this requirement in writing.
(B) The applicant shall file the appropriate application, pay the review fee and meet with the City Planner, other city staff and affected agencies. At the conference, the City Planner shall identify the relevant Comprehensive Plan policies, map designations, zone and development standards and procedural requirements that apply to the application. The Planner, staff and affected agencies shall provide technical direction and identify opportunities or constraints concerning the application.

(C) Failure of the city to provide any information required by this section does not constitute a waiver of any of the standards, criteria or requirements for the application. Due to possible changes in federal, state, regional and local law, the applicant is responsible for assuring the application complies with all applicable laws on the day the application is deemed complete.

Finding: A pre-application conference was held with the City of North Plains on March 12, 2021. This standard is met.

155.027 Neighborhood Meeting

The applicant or the applicant’s representatives should meet with adjacent property owners and neighborhood representatives prior to submitting an application to the city in order to solicit input and exchange information about the proposed development. The applicant for any Type III application, Comprehensive Plan Map or Zoning Map amendment, or annexation must provide for a neighborhood meeting with a recognized neighborhood or community organization. If no organization exists, then the applicant must provide for a meeting with adjacent property owners within a radius of 250 feet of the development site. Evidence of the neighborhood meeting shall be provided with the land use application in the form of an attendance sheet and notes from the meeting.

Finding: The Applicant held a duly-noticed neighborhood meeting on March 18, 2021. This standard is met.

155.028 Traffic Impact Study

(A) The purpose of this section is to assist in determining compliance with § 660-012-0045(2) of the state’s Transportation Planning Rule that requires the city to identify potential traffic impacts and apply conditions to development proposals to minimize certain impacts and protect transportation facilities.

(B) This chapter establishes the standards for when a proposal must be reviewed for potential traffic impacts, when a traffic impact study must be submitted with a development application in order to determine whether conditions are needed to minimize impacts to and protect transportation facilities, what must be in a traffic impact study and who is qualified to prepare the study.

(1) When a traffic impact study is required. The city or other authority with jurisdiction over an affected roadway may require a traffic impact study (TIS) as part of an application for development, a change in use or a change in access. A TIS may shall be required when a land use application involves one or more of the following actions:

   (a) A change in zoning or a plan amendment designation;
(b) Any proposed development that the road authority determines will have adverse operational or public safety impacts to the facility;
(c) An increase in site traffic volume generation by 300 average daily trips (ADT) or more;
(d) An increase in site traffic volume of a particular movement to and from the state highway by 20% or more;
(e) An increase in use of adjacent streets by vehicles exceeding the 20,000 pound gross vehicle weights by ten vehicles or more per day;
(f) The location of an access driveway does not meet minimum sight distance requirements, or is located where vehicles entering or leaving the property are restricted, or vehicles leaving or entering the property will queue or hesitate on the state highway, creating a safety hazard; or
(g) A change in internal traffic patterns that may cause safety problems, such as back up onto a street or greater potential for traffic accidents.

(2) Traffic impact study preparation. A traffic impact study shall be prepared by a professional engineer in accordance with the requirements of the road authority. If the road authority is the state’s Department of Transportation (ODOT), consult ODOT’s regional development review planner and OAR Chapter 731, Division 15.

Finding: A traffic study was required with the Brynhill Master Plan application. An update to the traffic study is required with each subsequent subdivision phase. The rowhome application does not change the trip generation as the rowhomes were included in the subdivision reviews. All traffic impact issues have been addressed for the first three phases of the Brynhill Master Plan, and the conditions imposed with the Master Plan and Subdivision reviews continue to apply. This standard is met.

(3) City street improvement requirements. In addition to street improvement requirements in this code for new development, see §§ 155.625 through 155.637 and 155.650 through 155.657 of this chapter for street improvement requirements related to residential and commercial and industrial developments and expansions.

Finding: The street improvements within Phases 1-3 of the Brynhill Master Plan have been reviewed and approved. All conditions imposed with the previous reviews continue to apply. The rowhomes do not change the approved streets. This standard is met.

155.031 Type III Quasi-Judicial Decisions by the Planning Commission

(A) Required. A pre-application conference is required for all Type III quasi-judicial applications under this section. The City Manager may waive this requirement at the request of the applicant.

Finding: As previously described, a pre-application conference was held with the City of North Plains on March 12, 2021 in compliance with Section 16.170.001.
(B) Requirements and procedures generally. The requirements and procedures for a pre-application conference are described in § 155.026 of this chapter.

(C) Application requirements.

(1) Application form. A quasi-judicial application shall be made on forms provided by the City Planner or his or her designee. The application shall include all property owner’s signatures of consent. Entities with condemnation authority are not required to provide a consent signature.

(2) Submittal information. A quasi-judicial application shall include:
   (a) The information requested on the application form;
   (b) One copy of a narrative statement that explains how the application satisfies each of the relevant criteria and standards in sufficient detail for review and decision-making;
   (c) The required fee pursuant to § 155.009 of this chapter;
   (d) One set of pre-stamped and pre-addressed envelopes for the record owner of all real property located within 250 feet of the site. The records of the County Assessor’s office are the official records for determining ownership. The applicant shall produce the notice list. At the applicant’s request, and upon payment of the fee noted on the city’s fee list, the city may prepare the public notice mailing list. The city or the applicant shall use the most current county real property assessment records to produce the notice list. The city shall mail the notice of application;
   (e) Evidence of the required neighborhood meeting, as specified in § 155.027 of this chapter; and
   (f) Appropriate service provider letters including, but not limited to, Clean Water Services and Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue.

(3) Completeness. Within 30 days of receiving an application for a Type III application, the city staff shall provide a dated notice to the applicant indicating whether the application is deemed complete or incomplete. If the application is incomplete, the City Planner shall notify the applicant in writing of exactly what information is missing. If deemed incomplete, the applicant has 180 days to submit the missing information, a refusal statement or to withdraw the application. If the applicant refuses to submit the required information and does not withdraw, the application shall be deemed complete upon receipt of the refusal letter.

(4) Final action. Final action on an application under this section shall occur within 120 days of completeness pursuant to § 155.011 of this chapter.

**Finding:** The applicant has met the requirements of this section and was deemed to have submitted a complete application on April 13, 2021.

**DESIGN REVIEW**

155.055 Type III Design Review Criteria

Approval of a Type III Design Review application shall be based on the following criteria:

A. Relation of Site Plan Elements to the Environment
1. The elements of the site plan shall be compatible with the natural environment and existing buildings and structures having a visual relationship with the site.

**Finding:** The proposed rowhome designs, depicted in the submitted elevations and renderings, are compatible with nearby single-family detached homes. The American and Farmhouse architectural styles are both typical in the Pacific Northwest and similar styles can be found throughout North Plains. Landscaping will be provided and will be compatible with the natural environment. This standard is met.

2. The elements of the site plan should promote energy conservation, and provide protection from adverse climatic conditions, noise and air pollution.

**Finding:** Every rowhome will have a covered front porch to provide protection from adverse climatic conditions. The windows will allow air flow and natural light, promoting energy conservation. Protection from air pollution will be the same as that of any residential structure. This standard is met.

3. Each element of the site plan shall effectively, efficiently and attractively serve its function. The elements shall be on a human scale, interrelated, and shall provide spatial variety and order.

**Finding:** The varied facades of each rowhome unit, the covered front porch entries and the alley-loaded vehicle access all support a human-scale, interrelated design that provides spatial variety and order. This standard is met.

4. In commercial and industrial zones adjacent to state or federal highways, and/or lying in county jurisdiction within urban growth boundaries, a coordinated circulation and access plan shall be submitted for the site and all properties in the immediate vicinity (no more than one-fourth mile to each site) to assure the public’s safety in entering or leaving the site, as well as when traveling through the area. This requirement may be waived by the planning staff if adequate access control and efficient and safe circulation can be obtained without the development and approval of a coordinated circulation and access plan.

**Finding:** This site is within the City limits not adjacent to State or Federal highways and, therefore, this standard is not applicable.

5. The site plan should be designed to provide a safe environment while offering appropriate opportunities for privacy and transitions from public to private spaces.

**Finding:** The site plan is designed to provide a safe environment while offering appropriate opportunities for privacy. Each home has an individual front porch and front yard. End units, which account for 45% of the proposed units (32 of 71), include side yard space as well. The
walkways from the front porch to the front sidewalk provide transitions from public to private spaces. This standard is met.

6. The landscape and existing grade shall be preserved to the maximum practical degree, considering development constraints and suitability of the landscape or grade to serve the applicant’s functions. Preserved trees and shrubs shall be protected during construction.

Finding: The existing grade is generally flat, which will be maintained. There is no existing landscape on the site, but site-appropriate, spatially ordered landscaping is proposed as shown on sheets L1 through L3 of the submitted plans. This standard is met.

7. The location and number of points of access to the site, the interior circulation patterns, the separations between pedestrians and moving and parked vehicles, and arrangement of parking areas in relation to building and structures, shall be harmonious with proposed and neighboring buildings and structures.

Finding: The layout of the site was previously determined with the approved master plan and subdivisions. The pedestrian access to each unit is via the front and the vehicular access to each unit is via the alley in the rear, separating the two uses. Parking is located within the 2-car garages associated with each use and on-street in front of the homes, a typical design for a residential home. This standard is met.

8. Surface drainage systems shall be designed so as to not adversely affect neighboring properties, streets and/or surface and subsurface water quality. All surface water shall be contained on-site.

Finding: Storm water drainage was reviewed and approved as part of the subdivision submittals. This standard is met.

9. Areas, structures and facilities for storage, machinery and equipment, services (mail, refuse, utility wires and the like), loading and parking and similar accessory areas and structures shall be designed, located, buffered or screened to minimize adverse impact on the site, adjacent right-of-way and neighboring properties. All roof-mounted equipment visible from neighboring properties or adjacent right-of-way shall be screened with materials complimentary to the building design materials.

Finding: The proposed rowhomes are residential and do not have the types of areas that would require buffering and screening. This standard is met.

10. All utility installations above ground, if such are allowed, shall be located so as to minimize adverse impacts on the site, adjacent right-of-way and neighboring properties.
Finding: All new utilities will be located underground as previously conditioned with the master plan and subdivisions. This standard is met.

11. For any access within the Light Industrial (M-1) Zone, the access shall be spaced a minimum of 200 feet from the nearest access on the same side of the street; this is to be coordinated between ODOT, the county and the city.

Finding: This site is within the NC zone and, as such, this standard is not applicable.

B. Required Landscaping
Areas Subject to Landscape Requirements: All use types as allowed in the particular zoning district, and subject to Design Review shall meet the provisions of this section.

1. Multi-family Residential. 15% landscaping of the gross lot area required. All areas subject to the final site plan and not otherwise improved shall be landscaped.

2. Community Commercial. 5% landscaping of the gross lot area required. All areas subject to the final site plan and not otherwise improved shall be landscaped.

3. General Commercial. 5% landscaping of the gross lot area required. All areas subject to the final site plan and not otherwise improved shall be landscaped. Screening by tall trees between highway commercial and adjacent residential zones, on side of highway commercial zone from highway to which it relates, such that the trees provide an attractive backdrop to elevated signage and adjacent residential uses.

4. Light Industrial. 5% landscaping of the gross lot area required. All areas subject to final site plan and not otherwise improved shall be landscaped.

5. Landscape Management. Natural vegetation is acceptable if maintained in a neat and fire safe manner.

6. Other Landscape Areas. All areas utilized for subsurface sewage disposal land treatment, except for single-family residences are required to be landscaped and maintained.

Finding: There is no minimum landscaping percentage for development of rowhomes in the NC zone. This standard is not applicable.

C. Landscaping in Parking and Loading Areas
In addition to the above provisions, the following landscape requirements apply to parking and loading areas.
1. A parking or loading area shall be separated from any lot line adjacent to a roadway by a landscaped strip at least five feet in width.

2. A landscaped strip separating a parking or loading area from a street shall contain:
   a) Street trees spaced as appropriate to the species, not to exceed 50 feet apart, on the average; and
   b) Low shrubs, not to reach a height greater than three feet, spaced no more than eight feet apart, on the average.

3. Vegetative ground cover if required.

4. Landscaping in a parking or loading area shall be located in defined landscaped areas which are uniformly distributed throughout the parking or loading area; and

5. The landscaping in a parking area shall have a width of not less than three feet.

Finding: The rowhomes will each have an alley-loaded garage in the rear of the dwelling unit. There are no parking areas or parking lots proposed with the rowhomes. This standard is met.

D. Irrigation

Provisions shall be made for watering planting areas where such care is required. Underground sprinklers may be required.

Finding: The landscaping will be irrigated consistent with all of the other homes in the Brynhill Master Plan. This standard is met.

E. Maintenance

Required landscaping shall be continuously maintained.

Finding: The landscaping will be maintained consistent with all of the other homes in the Brynhill Master Plan. This standard is met.

F. Special Requirements

The Planning Commission may require the following, in addition to the minimum requirements and standards of this chapter, as a condition of design review approval:

1. An increase in building separation, to afford improvement in light reception or air circulation or to afford greater fire resistance, based on building structural and fire flow requirements.

2. Additional off-street parking, according to specific requirements for the type of development.

3. Screening of the proposed use by a fence or landscaping.

4. Limitations on the size, location, intensity and number of exterior lights.

5. Limitations on the number, and location of curb cuts.
6. Improvement or enlargement of utilities serving the proposed use, where existing facilities will be burdened by the proposed use.
7. Landscaping or increases in landscaping requirements for the site.
8. Limitations on the number and size of signs.
9. Review of and adjustments in design for conformance with the historic architectural design theme.
10. Any other limitations or conditions it considers necessary to achieve the purposes of this ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.

**Finding:** There are no special requirements needed with this rowhome design review application. The rowhomes are located on lots identified for rowhome development in the original approval of the Brynhill Master Plan. This standard is met.

**NC NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY ZONE**

155.257 Permitted Uses
The following uses are permitted outright within the NC Zone when associated with an approved Master Plan:
(B) Single-family attached housing;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Min. Lot Size (sf)</th>
<th>Min. Lot Width (sf)</th>
<th>Min. Lot Depth (sf)</th>
<th>Max. Lot Coverage (%)</th>
<th>Max. Bldg. Height (ft)</th>
<th>Min. Front Setback (ft) Front/Alley Loaded</th>
<th>Min. Rear Setback (ft) Front/Alley Loaded</th>
<th>Min. Side Setback (ft)</th>
<th>Min. Street Side Setback (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family^1</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3^3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family^2</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15/12</td>
<td>3^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Medium Lot</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15/12</td>
<td>15/0</td>
<td>3^3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>10/0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15/12</td>
<td>10/0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15/12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Institutional</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Single-family detached homes - minimum standards for alley-loaded
2 Single-family detached homes - minimum standards for front-loaded
3 3-foot setback required on one side, 0-foot setback on the other side
4 The garage setback from an alley shall be 3-5 feet, or if providing an off-street parking space between the garage and alley the garage must be setback from the alley a minimum of 20 feet
5 Street-loaded garages shall have a minimum 20-foot setback to the face of garage and the garage face shall not extend beyond the front building elevation of the principle structure by more than 6 feet.
6 Porches, stoops, decks, balconies and other similar building projections may extend 4 feet beyond a front setback.
7 Accessory structures not attached to the principal structure shall maintain a 3-foot rear and side yard setback and shall not be located within the front yard setback.

8 Commercial/institutional/mixed-use structures adjacent to a residential use shall have a minimum setback of 10 feet along the adjoining yard.

9 Lot sizes, widths and/or depths may be reduced to 90% of the standard; provided, the overall lot average meets the corresponding lot size requirement.

10 Townhomes shall not exceed three (3) stories in height.

**Finding:** The proposed single family attached housing is permitted in the NC zoning district. All dimensional standards (listed in Table NC-1, above) are met, with the exception of the lot coverage maximum of 80% for townhomes (rowhomes). The applicant has requested a Master Plan Refinement to permit a maximum of 87% lot coverage for internal rowhome units. Staff finds that this standard is met with approval of the Master Plan Refinement request, discussed later in this report. If the request for Master Plan Refinement were not approved, a condition could be placed requiring compliance with the maximum lot coverage standards of the NC zone. However, as stated in this staff report, the applicant has provided adequate findings for the master plan refinement to permit a maximum of 87% lot coverage for the internal rowhome units. This standard is met.

**DUPLEX, TRIPLEX AND ATTACHED TWO SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS**

155.487 Standards and Requirements
The following standards and requirements shall govern the development of duplexes, triplexes and attached single-family dwellings.

(A) Minimum lot size. The minimum lot size of each dwelling unit shall be as specified by the base zone.

(B) Minimum building setbacks.
(1) All setbacks shall comply with the setbacks required in the underlying zone; except that, for interior side yards with a common wall, the side setback shall be zero feet.
(2) The location of all buildings shall comply with the vision clearance requirements of § 155.656 of this chapter.

**Finding:** The submitted site plan details the lot size and building dimensions for each rowhome unit, in compliance with the townhomes (rowhome) minimum lot size and setback standard in Table NC-1. This standard is met.

(C) Design standards. These standards are intended to: control development scale; avoid or minimize impacts associated with traffic, parking and design compatibility; and ensure management and maintenance of common areas.
(1) Building mass supplemental standard. The maximum number and width of consecutively attached townhouses (such as, with attached walls at property line) shall not exceed two units in the C-1 Zoning District and four units in the R-2.5 and R-5 Zoning Districts.
**Finding:** The proposed rowhomes are in the NC zone and therefore this standard is not applicable to the four- and five-unit buildings proposed with this application.

(2) Alley access.
(a) Townhouse subdivisions (creation of four or more lots for single-family attached dwellings) shall receive vehicle access only from a rear alley. Alley(s) shall be created at the time of subdivision approval.
(b) Alleys are not required when development patterns or topography make construction of an alley impracticable.
(c) As necessary, the city shall require dedication of right-of-way or easements and construction of pathways between townhouse lots (for example, between building breaks) to provide for pedestrian connectivity.

**Finding:** The previously approved subdivisions included the alleys from which each of the proposed rowhomes will receive vehicular access. Pedestrian connectivity is provided throughout the Brynhill development. This standard is met.

(3) Street access developments. Townhouses receiving access directly from a street shall comply with all of the following standards, in order to minimize interruption of adjacent sidewalks by driveway entrances, slow traffic, improve appearance of the streets, provide more on-street parking area and minimize paved surfaces for better storm water management.
(a) When garages face the street, they shall be flush with, or recessed behind, the front elevation (such as, living area or covered front porch).
(b) The maximum allowable curb cut and driveway apron width is 18 feet per dwelling unit. The remainder of the driveway facing the street may not exceed the width of the garage door, plus an additional four feet. The maximum combined garage width per unit is 50% of the total building width. For example, a 24-foot wide unit may have one 12-foot wide recessed garage facing the street.
(c) Two adjacent garages shall share one driveway when individual driveways would otherwise be separated by less than 20 feet (such as, the width of one on-street parking space). When a driveway serves more than one lot, the developer shall record an access and maintenance easement/agreement to benefit each lot, prior to building permit issuance.

**Finding:** As stated above, there are no street access rowhomes proposed with this application and as such, these standards are not applicable.

(4) Common areas. Common areas (for example, landscaping in private tracts, shared driveways, private alleys and similar uses) shall be maintained by a homeowners association or other legal entity. A homeowners association may also be responsible for exterior building maintenance. A copy of any applicable covenants, restrictions and conditions shall be recorded and provided to the city prior to building permit approval.
Finding: The Brynhill Master Plan and subsequent subdivision approvals, as well as the development agreements, detail the size, location and function of all common areas throughout Brynhill. There are no common areas specific to only the proposed rowhomes. This standard is met.

(D) Standards for approval. Such uses shall may be permitted as a special use upon the following findings.

1. The project shall comply with all other applicable provisions of this chapter.
2. The project will accommodate the traffic generated by providing adequate off-street parking, access points and additional street right-of-way and improvements and other traffic facilities as required.
3. All public and private improvements shall be developed to applicable city public works standards.
4. Pedestrian walkways shall be provided for adequate pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
5. The overall housing density of the project shall comply with that permitted in the underlying R Zone.
6. If proposed, private streets shall be owned and maintained by the owners of the lots which access the private street. A maintenance agreement shall be recorded which provides for the maintenance of the private street.

Finding: The proposed rowhomes comply with other applicable provisions of the Duplex, Triplex and Attached Two Single-Family Dwellings Chapter. The traffic generation of the project was included in the traffic impact analysis and conditions of approval required with the Brynhill Master Plan and Subdivisions. Public and private improvements are proposed to meet city Public Works standards. Pedestrian walkways are proposed to provide adequate pedestrian and bicycle access. Though not in an underlying R-zone, the overall housing density of the Brynhill Master Plan meets the NC zone requirements of a minimum 8.4 dwelling units per acre with a housing split of 70% single-family detached and 30% single-family attached/multifamily combined. The alleys will be privately owned and maintained by the HOA. The maintenance agreement will be recorded with the final subdivision plat. These standards are met.

155.488 Procedure
(A) The development of attached single-family dwellings pursuant to this section shall require the approval of either a land partition or subdivision in order to create the 2,500 or 3,750 square foot legal lots of record.
(B) The proposed development shall comply with all applicable procedures and standards of either §§ 155.565 through 155.570 and 155.585 through 155.599 of this chapter.
(C) A development agreement specifying that subsequent development on the lots be limited to attached single-family dwellings shall also be required.

Finding: The Brynhill Master Plan and subsequent subdivision approvals established the 1,300 to 1,681 square foot lots in compliance with the NC zoning district. The minimum lot size of §155.488(A) is in conflict with the minimum lot sizes in the NC zoning district, the underlying zone and therefore the prevailing standard. The underlying lots were found to meet the
provisions of §§155.585 through 155.599 (Subdivisions). The development of these lots for attached single-family dwellings was established with the Master Plan approval. These standards are met.

PUBLIC FACILITY AND SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

155.626 Application of Public Facility Standards
The provisions of this subchapter shall apply to development within the city as listed in the following table. No development permit shall be approved unless the following required improvements are provided to city standards prior to occupancy or operation unless an exception is approved by the City Council per § 155.628 of this chapter or future provision of the improvement is assured per § 155.629 of this chapter.

Finding: The provisions of §155.626 Public Facility and Service Requirements apply to the proposed rowhomes. However, the streets and utilities have all been established and approved with the original Master Plan approval and subsequent subdivision and master plan refinement approvals. The provisions of public facilities and streets will not be altered with the approval of this application. The provisions of the public facilities and streets code sections are met and will continue to be met as conditioned below.

CONDITION: The Conditions of approval of the following City Files continue to be in effect on this site: 19-061 (Brynhill Master Plan), 20-014 (Brynhill Subdivision Phase 1 and Master Plan Refinement) and 20-046 & 20-047 (Brynhill Subdivision Phase 2 [Phases 2 and 3] and Master Plan Refinement).

155.656 CLEAR VISION AREAS

Except in the C-1 Zone, a clear vision area shall be maintained on the corners of all property adjacent to the intersection of two streets, a street and a railroad or a driveway providing vehicular access to a public street, including alleys.

(A) Lots or parcels on street corners (public and/or private) shall maintain a sight triangle with no sight obstruction between three feet and ten feet in height as measured from street grade. Sight obstructions include, but are not limited to, fences, vegetation, berms, signs and structures. The sight triangle shall be measured from the street corner (apex), to a distance of 20 feet along each street side. (See Figure 1.) For the purpose of this section, a STREET CORNER is defined as that point where the extended edges of the road surface of two intersecting streets meet. The city may require additional vision clearance based on a hazard identified by the city. However, tree trunks and sign poles not exceeding 12 inches in diameter may be located within the vision clearance area; provided, the diameter does not exceed 24 inches.

(B) A private access shall be treated as a public street for the purpose of this section. The vision clearance area shall be determined in the manner set forth form herein. The edge of the
paved surface area of the private access, be it roadway, curb or sidewalk, shall be treated as the right-of-way line in determining the vision clearance area.

**Finding**: The plans demonstrate compliance with clear vision areas. This standard is met.

**OFF STREET PARKING AND LOADING**

155.673 Automotive Parking Requirements

(A) Residential.

(3) Multi-family dwellings and attached single-family dwellings*:

(a) Studio units or one-bedroom units: one space per dwelling unit;
(b) Two-bedroom units: 1.75 spaces per dwelling unit;
(c) Three-bedroom units: two spaces per dwelling unit; and
(d) Senior housing: 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit.

**Finding**: Each rowhome includes two garage parking spaces, meeting the requirement to provide two off-street parking spaces per three-bedroom rowhome unit. In addition, though not required, the submitted plans detail available on-street parking within the vicinity of the rowhomes. This standard is met.
COMPLIANCE WITH CITY OF NORTH PLAINS MUNICIPAL CODE

APPLICABLE REVIEW CRITERIA:
- NC Neighborhood Community Zone

NC NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY ZONE
Master Plans; Standards and Requirements

155.261 Procedure
F. In the process of reviewing applications for individual phases within an approved Master Plan, the Commission may approve the refinements to the Master Plan. Refinements to the Master Plan are defined as:

1. Changes to the street network or functional classification of streets that do not significantly reduce circulation system function or connectivity for vehicles, bicycles or pedestrians;

2. Changes to the nature or location of park type, trails or open space that do not significantly reduce land area, function, livability, usability, connectivity or overall distribution or availability of these uses in the Master Plan area; and

Finding: The proposed refinement does not include changes to the street network or functional classification of streets, or to the nature or location of park types, trails or open space. This standard is met.

3. Changes to the location or mix of land uses, or configuration of individual lots or site plan elements, that do not significantly alter the overall distribution or availability of uses or density in the Master Plan area.

Finding: The proposed refinement to allow a maximum of 87% lot coverage (instead of the NC zone maximum of 80%) on interior, small-lot rowhomes constitutes a change to the configuration of individual lots or site plan elements that do not significantly alter the overall distribution or availability of uses or density in the Master Plan area. This standard is met.

G. Refinements meeting the above definition may be approved by the Commission upon finding that:

1. The refinement(s) will equally or better meet the conditions of the approved Master Plan.
Finding: Allowing a 7 percent increase in the maximum lot coverage standard improves the Master Plan by allowing interior rowhomes that are compatible with the surrounding area (2-story homes that have 3-bedrooms and two-car garages). These are features typically reserved only for end units. This refinement will allow all proposed rowhome units (interior and end units) to be more marketable for families looking to buy in this community. This type of rowhome design is compatible with the size and style of homes in North Plains, but still provides for a diversity in home options within the Brynhill community that is consistent with the goals of the Master Plan. This refinement to allow 87% lot coverage for interior rowhome lots has no impact on the location or mix of land uses in the project. This standard is met.

2. The refinement will not preclude an adjoining phase from development consistent with the approved Master Plan.

Finding: The refinement to permit an increased maximum lot coverage for internal rowhome units will not preclude adjoining phases from development consistent with the approved master plan. The refinement will, however, apply to future rowhomes proposed in subsequent phases of the Brynhill Master Plan. This standard is met.
CONCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

DESIGN REVIEW, CITY FILE 21-016
The Planning Commission is considering approval of the Type III Design Review for construction of 71 rowhomes within phases 1-3 of the Brynhill Master Plan (City File Number 21-016).

Staff recommends approval of the design review application with the following conditions, and the conditions labeled “ongoing and general conditions”, below.

1. Submit to the City of North Plains a Type 1 Residential Building Permit Application with plot plan, elevation and required fee for each rowhome unit. The City will review all building permit applications prior to Washington County building permit review.

2. Maintenance agreements for the private alleys shall be recorded with the final subdivision plats for each subdivision phase.

3. With the exception of model homes approved based on the criteria of Development Code §155.092 (Temporary Uses), underlying subdivision plats must be recorded prior to building permit issuance for any rowhome.

4. In compliance with Development Code §155.010, the design review approval is void after one year unless substantial construction has taken place or the proposed use has occurred. Substantial construction means at least one rowhome cluster has received a building permit and is under construction. The Planning Commission may grant a one-year extension to the approval if the applicant files an extension request on or before the expiration date of the site plan approval.

MASTER PLAN REFINEMENT, CITY FILE 21-017
The Planning Commission is considering approval of a Master Plan Refinement to permit a maximum lot coverage of 87% for all interior rowhomes in the Brynhill Master Plan area, including Phases 1-3 and future development phases (City File Number 21-017).

Staff recommends approval of the application with the conditions labeled “ongoing and general conditions”, below.
ONGOING AND GENERAL CONDITIONS
(APPLICABLE TO THE DESIGN REVIEW AND THE MASTER PLAN REFINEMENT)

1. The Master Plan Development Agreement (December 31, 2019) agreed to between the City and the property owners, as well as all subsequent development agreements, shall remain in effect until and unless amended by the signatory parties.

2. The Conditions of approval of the following City Files continue to be in effect on this site: 19-061 (Brynhill Master Plan), 20-014 (Brynhill Subdivision Phase 1 and Master Plan Refinement) and 20-046 and 20-047 (Brynhill Subdivision Phase 2 [Phases 2 and 3] and Master Plan Refinement).

2. The Inadvertent Discovery Plan on this site shall remain in place through the duration of the site development. If remains are found, all work must stop and follow the plan. All archeological laws continue to apply.
Before the Planning Commission of the City of North Plains

In the matter of an application for Design Review and Master Plan Refinement Approval
Paine Tract, LLC and Lone Oak Land, LLC, OWNERS

FINAL ORDER AND NOTICE OF DECISION
Brynhill Rowhomes Design Review and Master Plan Refinement
Date of Decision: May 12, 2021

Whereas, a request was made on behalf of the property owners by applicant Lennar (11807 NE 99th Street, Suite 1170 Vancouver, WA 98682) for a type 3 design review approval and master plan refinement for construction of 71 rowhomes in phases 1-3 of the Brynhill Master Plan and to permit interior rowhome units in the Brynhill Master Plan area to be constructed with a maximum lot coverage of 88%; and

Whereas, the proposal includes Tax Lots 600, 800, 900 and 1000 of Washington County Tax Assessor’s Map 1N301 and is located north of NW North Avenue and west of NW 309th Avenue; and

Whereas, the owners must obtain master plan refinement and design review approval in order to develop the project as proposed; and

Whereas the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, and reviewed the application at its online meeting on May 12, 2021; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission considered the written and oral testimony presented by staff, the applicant and the public; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission accepted all findings included in the Staff Report dated May 5, 2021 regarding the design review application (21-016) but did not accept the findings regarding the master plan refinement (21-017); and

Whereas, having considered the applications and the evidence in the record, the Planning Commission adopted a motion to approve file number 21-016, approving the design review application but specifying that the standards of the NC zoning district shall apply to the rowhomes, specifically the 80% maximum lot coverage per lot; and

Whereas, having considered the applications and the evidence in the record, the Planning Commission adopted a motion to deny file number 21-017; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission instructed staff to prepare findings, conclusions and conditions in a final written order for the approval of the design review (21-016) and denial of the master plan refinement (21-017).

Now therefore, it is hereby ordered by the North Plains Planning Commission:

The Planning Commission approves the application, file number 21-016, based on the findings and conclusions contained in Exhibit A and subject to the conditions of approval contained in Exhibit B, which are attached hereto and which the Planning Commission hereby adopts as its findings, and determines to be reasonable.
The Planning Commission denies the application, file number 21-017, based on the finding that the 80% maximum lot coverage shall apply to all rowhome lots in the Brynhill Master Plan area.

Stewart King, Planning Commission Chair

5/13/2021
Date
APPEAL

The applicant or property owner, or any person who testified in writing or verbally at the public hearing of Land Use Files #21-016 and 21-017 may appeal either or both decisions to the North Plains City Council. Such appeal shall contain the appellant's standing to appeal the decision and the issue being raised in the appeal based on the approval criteria.

Any appeals must be submitted within 14 days of the date of this final order.

The deadline for appeals to be received by the City is Thursday, May 27, 2021 at 5:00 PM.

IF AN APPEAL IS RECEIVED BY THE CITY BEFORE THE APPEAL DEADLINE, A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE SCHEDULED BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL.
The Planning Commission adopts as its findings those listed in the Staff Report dated May 5, 2021, with the exception of those pertaining to the Master Plan Refinement request.

The Planning Commission finds that the 80% maximum lot coverage of the NC zone shall apply to all rowhome lots in the Brynhill Master Plan area.
Based upon the findings made by the North Plains Planning Commission the following conditions of approval are applicable to this Final Order:

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

**DESIGN REVIEW, CITY FILE 21-016**

1. Submit to the City of North Plains a Type 1 Residential Building Permit Application with plot plan, elevation and required fee for each rowhome unit. The City will review all building permit applications prior to Washington County building permit review.

2. Maintenance agreements for the private alleys shall be recorded with the final subdivision plats for each subdivision phase.

3. With the exception of model homes approved based on the criteria of Development Code §155.092 (Temporary Uses), underlying subdivision plats must be recorded prior to building permit issuance for any rowhome.

4. In compliance with Development Code §155.010, the design review approval is void after one year unless substantial construction has taken place or the proposed use has occurred. Substantial construction means at least one rowhome cluster has received a building permit and is under construction. The Planning Commission may grant a one-year extension to the approval if the applicant files an extension request on or before the expiration date of the site plan approval.

5. The Master Plan Development Agreement (December 31, 2019) agreed to between the City and the property owners, as well as all subsequent development agreements, shall remain in effect until and unless amended by the signatory parties.

6. The Conditions of approval of the following City Files continue to be in effect on this site: 19-06! (Brynhill Master Plan), 20-014 (Brynhill Subdivision Phase 1 and Master Plan Refinement) and 20-046 and 20-047 (Brynhill Subdivision Phase 2 [Phases 2 and 3] and Master Plan Refinement).

7. The Inadvertent Discovery Plan on this site shall remain in place through the duration of the site development. If remains are found, all work must stop and follow the plan. All archeological laws continue to apply.
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I. PROPOSAL SUMMARY

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Lennar Northwest, Inc.
11807 NE 99th Street Suite 1100
Vancouver, WA 98682
(360) 258-7900

Applicants’ Representative: Pacific Community Design, Inc.
12564 SW Main Street
Tigard, OR 97223
(503) 941-9484
Contacts: Stacy Connery, AICP
stacy@pacific-community.com
Eric Hawkinson
eric@pacific-community.com
Patrick Espinosa, PE
patrick@pacific-community.com

Property Owners:
Tax Lot 1N3010000900:
Lone Oak Land, LLC
Susan C. Cropp
34059 NW Mountaingale Rd.
North Plains, OR 97133

Tax Lot 1N3010000800:
Paine Tract, LLC
Wayne Rembold
10305 SW Park Way, Suite 204
Portland, OR 97225

Tax Lot 1N3010000600 & 1000
Lennar Northwest, Inc.
11807 NE 99th Street Suite 1100
Vancouver, WA 98682
(360) 258-7900

Site Location
Northwest of the intersection of NW North Avenue and NW 309th Avenue within the City’s Urban Growth Boundary (“UGB”)

Map and Tax Lots
Tax Map 1N3011 Tax Lot 600, 800, 900, & 1000

Site Area
50.4 acres

City Comprehensive Plan
Map Designation
Neighborhood Community (“NC”)

City’s Zoning District
Neighborhood Community (“NC”)

Requested Approval
Design Review of Rowhomes
Master Plan Refinement
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests design review approval for the proposed rowhomes located in Brynhill Phases 1-3. In addition, the applicant requests a master plan refinement to allow interior rowhome units to exceed 80 percent of maximum lot coverage specified in the Neighborhood Community (NC) zone. While refining design review plans for this application, it was discovered that some interior rowhome units on smaller lots (1,300-1,310 square feet) have a maximum 87 percent lot coverage, so the applicant requests a 7 percent increase in the 80 percent maximum lot coverage standard. End units and several interior units on larger lots (1,400-1,681 square feet) meet the maximum lot coverage standard. This refinement to the maximum lot coverage on interior rowhome lots allows the builder to provide row home units with three bedrooms and two-car garage. The Master Plan Refinement request to allow 87% lot coverage for interior Row Homes supports the proposed row home design, which is compatible with the size and style of homes within North Plains and contributes to the variety of homes available within Brynhill, consistent with the purpose of the Master Plan and the NC zone. Additionally, the Master Planner, Rudy Kadlub has reviewed the proposed row homes and confirmed the designs are in compliance with the Brynhill Pattern Book.

A pre-application meeting was held on March 12, 2021 and the applicant held a neighborhood meeting March 18, 2021 to solicit input and exchange information about the proposed application.

SITE DESCRIPTION & HISTORY OF PRIOR APPROVALS

The project site is 50.4 acres and is described as Tax Lots 1N3010000600, 800, 900 and 1000. All tax lots are within the City of North Plains. This subject site is zoned for Neighborhood Community (NC) by the City of North Plains (City) and is within the Brynhill Master Plan area, which was approved in August 2019. The Phase 1 Subdivision and Master Plan Refinement was approved in 2020, and the Phase 2 & 3 Preliminary Subdivision and Master Plan Refinement was approved in 2021. The subject site is generally located northwest of the intersection of NW North Avenue and NW 309th Avenue. The surrounding area is comprised of single-family residential development in the City and agricultural land outside the City Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Land to the south and east is in the City’s R-7.5 Zone. Land to the north and west is beyond the City limits and is outside the UGB. The site slopes generally south, with the low point near the central southern edge of the project area. The site is accessed via NW 309th Avenue to the east. The site is currently in agricultural use and contains no trees. A site assessment and environmental plan review performed by Pacific Habitat Services determined there are no wetlands that exist on the site. The Clean Water Services Service Provider Letter (SPL) is included as Exhibit E.
II. Compliance with City of North Plains Zoning & Development Code

155.025 List of Types of Review Procedures.
The following lists set forth the type of review procedure for administrative and land use applications.

(C) Type III quasi-judicial permits by Planning Commission.

(3) Design review permit;

(22) Refinement to an approved master plan; and

Response: The applicant requests a design review and master plan refinement permit for the rowhomes in Brynhill phases 1-3.

155.026 Pre-application Conference.

(A) A pre-application conference is recommended for Type II and required for Type III and IV permits. The City Manager may waive this requirement in writing.

(B) The applicant shall file the appropriate application, pay the review fee and meet with the City Planner, other city staff and affected agencies. At the conference, the City Planner shall identify the relevant Comprehensive Plan policies, map designations, zone and development standards and procedural requirements that apply to the application. The Planner, staff and affected agencies shall provide technical direction and identify opportunities or constraints concerning the application.

(C) Failure of the city to provide any information required by this section does not constitute a waiver of any of the standards, criteria or requirements for the application. Due to possible changes in federal, state, regional and local law, the applicant is responsible for assuring the application complies with all applicable laws on the day the application is deemed complete.

Response: A pre-application conference was held on March 12, 2021. A copy of the notes from the meeting are documented in Exhibit B.

155.027 Neighborhood Meeting.
The applicant or the applicant’s representatives should meet with adjacent property owners and neighborhood representatives prior to submitting an application to the city in order to solicit input and exchange information about the proposed development. The applicant for any Type III application, Comprehensive Plan Map or Zoning Map amendment, or annexation must provide for a neighborhood meeting with a recognized neighborhood or community organization. If no organization exists, then the applicant must provide for a meeting with adjacent property owners within a radius of 250 feet of the development site. Evidence of the neighborhood meeting shall be provided with the land use application in the form of an attendance sheet and notes from the meeting.

Response: A neighborhood meeting, in accordance with the requirements of this chapter, was held on March 18, 2021 and is documented in Exhibit B.

155.031 Type III Quasi-Judicial Decisions by the Planning Commission.

Response: The applicant followed the application requirements as listed in this chapter and documented throughout this submittal package.
DESIGN REVIEW

155.046 DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS.
A building, grading, parking or development permit, as specified in this chapter shall not be issued for a use subject to this section, nor shall such uses be commenced, enlarged, altered, changed or moved until a design review application is approved by the city.
Response: The applicant is pursuing this design review application for rowhomes prior to any building, grading, parking or development permit.

155.047 DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL PROCEDURES.
Design review is required for all new developments and modifications of existing developments described below. Regular maintenance, repair and replacement of existing materials (such as, roof, siding, awnings and the like), parking resurfacing and similar maintenance and repair shall be exempt from review.
Response: The rowhome design review will be a Type III application to be reviewed by the Planning Commission including a public hearing in accordance with this chapter.

155.048 FILING PROCEDURE.
Design review applications shall be filed on a Planning Department form as provided by the city and shall be accompanied by such drawings, sketches and descriptions as the city deems necessary to describe the proposed development. An application shall not be deemed complete unless all information requested is provided.
Response: Exhibit A of this submittal includes signed application forms provided by the city. The Preliminary Plans are detailed in Exhibit C.

155.049 PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE.
If required, the applicant shall schedule a pre-application conference prior to filing a design review application.
Response: A pre-application conference was held on March 12, 2021. Pre-application notes can be found in Exhibit B.

155.050 APPLICATION.
Following the pre-application conference, the applicant shall submit the formal application to the city accompanied by the appropriate fee and application materials, along with a site development plan and other information in accordance with the pre-application meeting and the requirements of this chapter.
Response: Exhibit A of this submittal includes signed application forms. Once submitted, a check for the submittal fee will be delivered to City Hall. The application materials (i.e. plans, SPLs etc.) can be found in the other exhibits in this submittal package.

155.051 FILING.
A design review application must be filed for any of the following uses, except for single-family or duplex construction and accessory structures and unless determined to be a Type II limited land use review pursuant to § 155.047(A) of this chapter:
(A) New buildings or structures;
Response: This proposal involves new rowhomes, which is not single-family or duplex construction, therefore design review is applicable.

155.052 DESIGN REVIEW PLAN; SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS.
(A) Information requirements. Information provided on the design review plan shall conform to the following:
(1) Drawings depicting the proposal shall be presented on sheets not larger than 24 inches by 26 inches in the number of copies directed by the city;
Response: The preliminary plans (Exhibit C) are no larger than 24 x 26 inches in size.

(2) Drawings shall be at a scale sufficiently large enough to enable all features of the design to be clearly discerned;
Response: The preliminary plans (Exhibit C) are shown at various scales to ensure all features of the design are clearly discerned.

(3) An electronic copy of the drawings shall be submitted in Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) or other software format designated by the city; and
Response: This submittal includes electronic copy of all application materials in (.pdf) form.

(4) A development anticipating more than one business on the premises shall submit a uniform sign plan with the land use application for design review.
Response: This development does not include businesses on the premises, and therefore no sign plan is proposed.

(B) Existing conditions. This element of the design review plan, which may be in a freehand form to scale, shall indicate the following site characteristics:
(1) Location and species of trees greater than six inches in diameter when measured four and one-half feet above the natural grade, and an indication of which trees are to be removed;
(2) On sites that contain steep slopes, potential geologic hazard or unique natural features that may affect the proposed development, the city may require contours mapped at two-foot intervals;
(3) Natural drainage ways and other significant natural features;
(4) All buildings, roads, retaining walls, curb-cuts and other human-made features; and
(5) Natural features, including trees and structures on adjoining property having a visual or other significant relationship with the site.
Response: Sheet 2 (Exhibit C) details existing conditions and topography the site. There are no trees or natural features that would impact the proposed development. Phase 1-3 have land use approval for preliminary subdivision, and phase 1 is currently under construction.

(C) Site photographs. Photographs depicting the site and its relationship to adjoining sites may also be provided.
Response: A site aerial was provided with the more recent subdivision applications.

(D) Site development plan. This element of the design review plan shall indicate the following:
(1) Legal description of the lot;
(2) Boundary dimensions and area of the site;
(3) Location of all new structures and existing structures proposed to be retained, including their distances from the property line;
(4) Area of the site covered by the structures described in division (D)(3) above and their percentage of the site;
Response: The approved preliminary plat for phases 1-3 details the lots for each rowhome. The Site Plan (Sheet 3 - Exhibit C) details the site boundary, location of the proposed rowhomes, and the area of the site covered by each block of rowhomes.

(6) All external dimensions of proposed buildings and structures;
Response: The Site Plan (sheets 3.2-3.6 Exhibit C) demonstrate all external dimensions for the rowhomes.

(7) The location of a building’s windows, doors, entrances and exits;
Response: The proposed floorplans and elevations (Exhibit G) detail the location of windows, doors, entrances, and exits for the rowhome product.

(8) Parking and circulation areas, including their dimensions;
Response: The Site Plan (sheets 3-3.6 Exhibit C) also shows site circulation and proposed parking stalls in accordance with the approved preliminary subdivision plans for Brynhill Phases 1-3.

(9) Service areas for such uses as the loading and delivery of goods;
Response: No service areas are proposed with this application.

(10) Locations, descriptions and dimensions of easements;
Response: The approved preliminary plat for phases 1-3 details locations, descriptions, and dimensions of easements. This application does not request to change easements as reviewed and approved by Planning Commission.

(11) Grading and drainage plans, including spot elevations and contours at close enough intervals to easily convey their meaning;
Response: The grading and drainage plans are detailed on sheet X (Exhibit C).

(12) Location of areas to be landscaped;
Response: The rowhome landscape plans (sheets L1-L3 Exhibit C) demonstrate areas to be landscaped on lots.

(13) Private and shared outdoor recreation areas;
Response: The approved preliminary subdivision plans for phases 1-3 details all common open space and recreation areas to be located throughout Brynhill phases 1-3.

(14) Pedestrian circulation;
Response: The Site Plan (sheets 3-3.6 Exhibit C) also shows site pedestrian circulation and sidewalks, trails, and walkways that lead to the front of each rowhome unit.

(15) The location of mechanical equipment, garbage disposal areas, utility appurtenances and similar structures;
Response: The Site Plan (sheets 3-3.6 Exhibit C) shows the location of PUEs.
(15) Exterior lighting on the proposed building(s), including the type, intensity and area to be illuminated;
Response: Exterior lighting and sign illumination are not proposed with this design review application.

(16) Location, size and method of illumination of signs;
Response: 

(17) Provisions for handicapped persons;
Response: The proposed rowhomes do not include provisions for handicapped persons.

(18) Other site elements which will assist in the evaluation of site development;
(19) The location and names of all existing streets within or on the boundary of the proposed development;
Response: The Site Plan (Exhibit C) details the location and names of all existing streets within or on the boundary of the proposed development.

(20) A written summary showing the following:
   (a) For commercial and non-residential development:
       1. The square footage contained in the area proposed to be developed;
       2. The percentage of the lot covered by structures;
       3. The percentage of the lot covered by parking areas and the total number of parking spaces; and
       4. The total square footage for all landscaped areas including the percentage consisting of natural materials and the percentage consisting of hard-surfaced areas such as courtyard.
Response: This design review application is not commercial, or non-residential development.

   (b) For residential development:
       1. The total square footage in the development;
       2. The number of dwelling units in the development (include the units by the number of bedrooms in each unit (such as, ten one-bedroom, 25 two-bedroom and the like)); and
       3. Percentage of the lot covered by:
          a. Structures;
          b. Parking areas;
          c. Recreation areas; and
          d. Landscaping.
Response: The Site Plan (sheet 3 Exhibit C) details site information including overall site area and percentage of rowhome site coverage (3.34 percent of total area in Phases 1-3). The Site Plan also includes typical lot coverage for each rowhome (corner and interior lots). The landscape plans (L1-L3 Exhibit C) detail proposed landscaping on the rowhome lots.

(E) Landscape plan. Development proposals with a total project cost exceeding $250,000 may be required to have the landscape plan prepared by a licensed landscape architect. This element of the design review plan should indicate the following:
(1) The size, species and locations of plant materials to be retained or placed on the site;
(2) The layout of proposed irrigation facilities;
(3) The location and design details of walkways, plaza, courtyards and similar seating areas, including related street furniture and permanent outdoor equipment including sculpture;

(4) The location, type and intensity of lighting proposed to illuminate outdoor areas;

(5) The location and design details of proposed fencing, retaining walls and trash collection areas; and

(6) For commercial projects with a total project cost exceeding $250,000, a rendering showing the proposed landscape plan in perspective. Such renderings shall be prepared for each of the project’s main elevations.

Response: This is not a commercial project. The landscape plans (L1-L3 Exhibit C) detail proposed landscaping on the rowhome lots, including size, species and location of plant materials and design of walkways on individual lots in relation to community sidewalk connections. The proposal does not involve irrigation facilities, illuminated outdoor areas, or fencing/walls/trash collection areas.

(F) Architectural drawings. This element of the design review plan shall indicate the following:

(1) A plot plan specifying the building footprint and dimensions, including all points of access. Floor plans of interior spaces to the extent required to clarify access functions. Such floor plans shall be provided for all building floors and shall include appropriate dimensions;

(2) Exterior elevations showing finish materials, windows, doors, light fixtures, stairways, balconies, decks and architectural details. These elevations shall be provided for every exterior wall surface, including those which are completely or partially concealed from view by overlapping portions of the structure. Existing and finished grades at the center of all walls shall be shown with elevations of floors indicated and a dimension showing compliance with height limitations;

(3) The color and texture of finish materials shall be described on the drawings and samples shall be submitted of the materials and color ranges of siding, roofing and trim;

(4) Location and type of exterior light fixtures including the lamp types and levels of illumination that they provide; and

(5) A comprehensive graphic plan showing the location, size, material and method of illumination of all exterior signs, subject to the other applicable requirements of this chapter. At the applicant’s option, this plan may be submitted for approval at any time prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.

Response: The Site Plan (Exhibit C) dimensions the building footprint, including all points of access. The proposed floorplans and elevations (Exhibit G) provide architectural details and renderings in accordance with this section.

(G) Architectural model.

(1) Architectural models may be required for:

(a) All new construction, other than duplexes or triplexes; and

(b) Alterations to existing structures other than duplexes or triplexes where the proposed alteration involves the addition of one thousand square feet of gross floor area or more.

(2) The model shall be to scale and represent the proposed development and adjoining buildings within 50 feet of applicant’s property lines.
(3) The model need only be a massing model sufficient to illustrate the relationship of the proposed structure(s) to the site and surrounding properties.

Response: Staff indicated during the Pre-Application Conference meeting that an architectural model is not applicable or required for this design review application.

(H) Property survey.

(1) A survey of the property by a licensed land surveyor clearly delineating property boundaries. The city may waive this requirement where there is a recent survey which can be used to establish the applicant’s property boundaries.

(2) Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, the applicant will have clearly marked the corners of proposed buildings and other significant features proposed for the site.

Response: Prior to preliminary subdivision application for Brynhill Phases 1-3, a survey of the property was complete by a licensed land surveyor, with boundaries clearly marked.

155.053 ENGINEER’S ASSESSMENT.

Prior to the development of lots containing unstable soils as defined by this chapter, the city shall require a registered engineer’s assessment of the design and structural techniques needed to mitigate potential hazards. In the event there are inadequate mitigation measures, the city shall prohibit development.

Response: Prior engineer assessments of the site, during master plan and preliminary subdivision state, have determined that there are no unstable soils on this site.

155.054 DOCUMENTATION.

All documentation and completed plans required by the Planning Commission shall be submitted and approved prior to obtaining any required permits or licenses.

Response: The applicant is pursuing this design review application for the rowhomes prior to building permits.

155.055 TYPE III DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA.

Approval of a Type III design review application shall be based on the following criteria.

(A) Relation of site plan elements to the environment.

(1) The elements of the site plan shall be compatible with the natural environment and existing buildings and structures having a visual relationship with the site.

(2) The elements of the site plan should promote energy conservation and provide protection from adverse climatic conditions, noise and air pollution.

(3) Each element of the site plan shall effectively, efficiently and attractively serve its function. The elements shall be on a human scale, interrelated and shall provide spatial variety and order.

(4) In commercial and industrial zones adjacent to state or federal highways, and/or lying in county jurisdiction within urban growth boundaries, a coordinated circulation and access plan shall be submitted for the site and all properties in the immediate vicinity (no more than one-fourth mile to each site) to assure the public’s safety in entering or leaving the site, as well as when traveling through the area. This requirement may be waived by the planning staff if adequate access control and efficient and safe circulation can be obtained without the development and approval of a coordinated circulation and access plan.

(5) The site plan should be designed to provide a safe environment while offering appropriate opportunities for privacy and transitions from public to private spaces.
(6) The landscape and existing grade shall be preserved to the maximum practical degree, considering development constraints and suitability of the landscape or grade to serve the applicant’s functions. Preserved trees and shrubs shall be protected during construction.

(7) The location and number of points of access to the site, the interior circulation patterns, the separations between pedestrians and moving and parked vehicles, and arrangement of parking areas in relation to building and structures, shall be harmonious with proposed and neighboring buildings and structures.

(8) Surface drainage systems shall be designed so as to not adversely affect neighboring properties, streets and/or surface and subsurface water quality. All surface water shall be contained on-site.

(9) Areas, structures and facilities for storage, machinery and equipment, services (mail, refuse, utility wires and the like), loading and parking and similar accessory areas and structures shall be designed, located, buffered or screened to minimize adverse impact on the site, adjacent right-of-way and neighboring properties. All roof-mounted equipment visible from neighboring properties or adjacent right-of-way shall be screened with materials complimentary to the building design materials.

(10) All utility installations above ground, if such are allowed, shall be located so as to minimize adverse impacts on the site, adjacent right-of-way and neighboring properties.

(11) For any access within the Light Industrial (M-1) Zone, the access shall be spaced a minimum of 200 feet from the nearest access on the same side of the street; this is to be coordinated between ODOT, the county and the city.

Response: The Site Plan (sheets 3-3.6 Exhibit C) demonstrates compliance with the design review criteria of this chapter.

(B) Required landscaping; areas subject to landscape requirements. All use types as allowed in the particular zoning district, and subject to design review shall meet the provisions of this section.

(1) Multi-family residential: 15% landscaping of the gross lot area required. All areas subject to the final site plan and not otherwise improved shall be landscaped.

(2) Community commercial: 5% landscaping of the gross lot area required. All areas subject to the final site plan and not otherwise improved shall be landscaped.

(3) General commercial: 5% landscaping of the gross lot area required. All areas subject to the final site plan and not otherwise improved shall be landscaped. Screening by tall trees between highway commercial and adjacent residential zones, on side of highway commercial zone from highway to which it relates, such that the trees provide an attractive backdrop to elevated signage and adjacent residential uses.

(4) Light industrial: 5% landscaping of the gross lot area required. All areas subject to final site plan and not otherwise improved shall be landscaped.

(5) Natural vegetation is acceptable if maintained in a neat and fire safe manner.

(6) All areas utilized for subsurface sewage disposal land treatment, except for single-family residences are required to be landscaped and maintained.

Response: This application involves landscaping for single-family attached rowhomes and is therefore not subject to the criteria listed in above. The landscape plans (L1-L3 Exhibit C) demonstrate proposed landscaping on each rowhome lot.
(C) Landscaping in parking and loading areas. In addition to the above provisions, the following landscape requirements apply to parking and loading areas:
Response: There are no parking and loading areas in this proposal.

(D) Irrigation. Provisions shall be made for watering planting areas where such care is required. Underground sprinklers may be required.
Response: This proposal does not include irrigation.

(E) Maintenance. Required landscaping shall be continuously maintained.
Response: HOA owned landscape tracts will be continuously maintained.

(F) Special requirements. The Planning Commission may require the following, in addition to the minimum requirements and standards of this chapter, as a condition of design review approval:
(1) An increase in building separation, to afford improvement in light reception or air circulation or to afford greater fire resistance, based on building structural and fire flow requirements;
(2) Additional off-street parking, according to specific requirements for the type of development;
(3) Screening of the proposed use by a fence or landscaping;
(4) Limitations on the size, location, intensity and number of exterior lights;
(5) Limitations on the number and location of curb cuts;
(6) Improvement or enlargement of utilities serving the proposed use, where existing facilities will be burdened by the proposed use;
(7) Landscaping, or increases in landscaping requirements, for the site.
(8) Limitations on the number and size of signs;
(9) Review of and adjustments in design for conformance with the historic architectural design theme; and
(10) Any other limitations or conditions it considers necessary to achieve the purposes of this chapter and the Comprehensive Plan.
Response: The applicant is not aware of any special requirements that are applicable to this rowhome design review proposal.

155.056 SPECIFIC USE STANDARDS.
Response: The Specific Use Standards are not applicable to single-family rowhomes.

155.057 VIOLATION.
 Failure to comply with an approved design review and site plan and any conditions of approval shall be a zoning violation, subject to the requirements of this chapter.
NC NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY ZONE

155.257 PERMITTED USES.
The following uses are permitted outright within the NC Zone when associated with an approved Master Plan:

(A) Single-family detached housing;
(B) Single-family attached housing;
(C) Duplexes or triplexes;
(D) Rowhouses/townhomes;
(E) Multi-family dwellings;
(F) Accessory dwellings and accessory structures, subject to §§ 155.500 through 155.502 of this chapter;
(G) Mixed-use (including residential, commercial and/or institutional uses);
(H) Parks and permanent open space;
(I) Neighborhood commercial uses;
(J) Certified family child care home;
(K) Residential homes;
(L) Residential facility; and
(M) Manufactured homes on individual lots, subject to §§ 155.515 through 155.518 of this chapter.

Response: Rowhouse development is a permitted use in the NC zone.

155.259 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

(A) No development may occur within the NC Zone prior to Master Plan approval. Master plans in these areas shall include a mix of uses that may include residential, commercial, institutional and light industrial. The land use mix shall generally reflect the concept plan adopted when an area is brought into the urban growth boundary, or as modified through Master Plan approval. The following standards apply to all development in the NC Zoning District.

Response: The Brynhill Master Plan was approved (Casefile 19-061) on August 14, 2019. Subsequently, the applicant has received approval for preliminary subdivision applications on Brynhill Phases 1-3. This design review application focuses on the rowhomes located throughout Brynhill Phases 1-3. In addition to the design review applicant, the applicant is requesting a master plan refinement to the NC zone development standards that will allow interior rowhome units to exceed the maximum 80 percent lot coverage by 7 percent, for a maximum 87 percent maximum lot coverage. This master plan refinement will not alter compliance with any other development standards associated with the Brynhill Master Plan and will allow interior rowhomes to have three bedrooms and two-car garages, features typically reserved only for end units.

(1) Municipal parks shall be provided at a minimum rate of 400 square feet for every one dwelling unit. In addition, municipal parks shall be provided at a minimum rate of 5,000 square feet for every one acre of land that is not designated exclusively residential (such as commercial, industrial, institutional or mixed-use). Municipal parks are intended for active recreational use. Wetlands, water quality facilities (swale) and other types of passive open space may not count toward the minimum municipal park requirement. The Planning Commission will utilize the Master Plan review process to determine the location, size and functionality of proposed parks.
Response: The Brynhill Master Plan set aside 4.89 acres of municipal park space; 4.66 acres for the 508 dwelling units and 0.23 acres for the 2-acre mixed-use site. Compliance with this standard was shown at the time of preliminary subdivision application. The proposed rowhome design review and its associated master plan refinement do not alter compliance with this standard.

(2) In order to promote a variety of housing types and efficient land use, a minimum of 30% of the proposed residential development in a Master Plan shall be either attached single-family or multi-family housing. If a Master Plan includes a minimum of 20% of the total proposed housing as multi-family residential, a 20% increase in density will be permitted to the multi-family housing proposed.

Response: The Brynhill Master Plan was required by the NC zone to have 8.4 units per net acre, as well as a residential mix of single-family attached (30 percent) and detached housing (70 percent). As specified in the standard above, the 30 percent may be either attached single-family or multi-family housing. The NC zone also required the Master Plan to reserve 2 acres of land for mixed-use development options. The NC zone allows for a 2-percent deviation—either up or down—for the 30/70 percent residential mix requirement. The Master Plan utilized this 2-percent deviation to provide a potential range of units at the reserved mixed-use area.

Table 1 shows the minimum density for multi-family results in a residential split of 28 percent attached units and 72 percent detached units. The maximum allowable density for multi-family would result in 31 percent attached units and 69 percent detached units.

The approved preliminary subdivision for Phase 2 & 3 included Master Plan Refinement to widen the rowhome products, allowing for two-story (as opposed to three-story) units with attached two-car garages. This application requests an additional refinement to allow interior rowhomes to exceed the 80 percent maximum lot coverage that applies to rowhomes (townhomes) in the NC zone. This refinement does not alter the development’s compliance with the minimum 8.4 units per net acre density and 70/30 mix utilizing the 2-percent deviation.

Table 1 Net Density and Density Mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Minimum (MF)</th>
<th>Maximum (MF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowhome Attached</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units/Net Acre (57.864)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The original approved Master Plan contained a range of 26-48 multi-family units and a maximum of 508 units overall.

(B) Development within the NC District shall comply with the standards for lot size and dimensional requirements, lot coverage, building height and setbacks as contained within Table NC-1: Development Standards, or as modified and approved during the Master Plan process. Builders and developers are encouraged to create dwellings that meet contemporary lifestyles.
Response: With the proposed refinement, the rowhomes comply with the development standards in Table NC-1. None of the proposed rowhomes exceed three (3) stories in height. Each lot has a minimum 20 feet width and exceeds the lot depth of 50 feet. There is no minimum lot size required.

The Site Plan demonstrates the proposed rowhome lots meet the setback standards of the Table NC-1. (Note: Lots 296 and 297 have a porch eave that extends less than 1 foot beyond the 6-foot front porch setback as allowable per Chapter 155.530 (Projections from Buildings) “Cornices, eaves, canopies, sunshades, gutters, chimneys, flues and other similar architectural features may project not more than two feet into a required yard or into required open space as established by coverage standards.” Since the projection is less than 2 feet, these lots (296-297) comply with the setback standards).

While refining plans for this design review application, it became apparent that interior rowhomes on the smaller lots (1,300-1,310 square feet) would exceed the 80 percent maximum lot standard (see the Site Plan on Exhibit C, which details a typical interior unit with 87 percent lot coverage). Therefore, the applicant is requesting a master plan refinement to allow interior units to exceed the maximum lot coverage standard by 7 percent (a less than 10 percent deviation). This refinement will allow the rowhomes to be more accessible for families looking to buy in this community, providing for a range of housing options within Brynhill that are also compatible with the size and style of homes within North Plains.
(C) Development within the NC District shall provide off-street vehicular and bicycle parking per § 155.676 of this chapter, or as modified and approved during the Master Plan process.

Response: The development complies with off street vehicular and bicycle parking requirements addressed in NPDC Chapter 155.676 within the following sections of this report.

(D) In the NC Zoning District, a minimum of two acres shall be reserved from exclusive residential development so that commercial, institutional and/or mixed-use development options are available. This reserved area shall be included in one of the development phases proposed with the Master Plan. If development has not occurred in this reserved area for a minimum of five years from the issuance of the final occupancy permit of the final residential unit in the same development phase as the reserved area, then the applicant may submit an application for subdivision or design review to the city for exclusive residential development, with the Planning Commission as the review and decision authority. The reserved area can be used as temporary open space in the interim.

Response: The approved Master Plan reserved 2.02 acres within Phase 1 identified for mixed-use development and a range of 26-48 multi-family units. The approved Phase 2 & 3 Master Plan Refinement adjusted the density range to 30-48 multi-family units. The future mixed-use area is subject to subsequent review of a design review application, which will determine the actual amount of commercial space, number of residential units, and amount of off-street parking to be provided. This design review/master plan refinement application has no impact on the project’s compliance with this standard.

155.260 MASTER PLANS; STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.

The following standards and requirements shall govern the application for Master Plan approval within the NC Zone.

(A) The land uses in a Master Plan shall generally reflect the concept plan adopted when an area is brought into the urban growth boundary, or as modified through Master Plan approval. Flexibility in arrangement of uses and densities is permitted provided that the overall Master Plan is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density ranges as identified in the adopted Concept Plan.

Response: The approved Brynhill Master Plan demonstrated it is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density ranges identified by the adopted Concept Plan. This application proposes a rowhome design review with a few master plan refinements, detailed further in the subsequent section. Modifications are allowed under NPDC Chapter 155.259, which states that the land uses “shall generally reflect the concept plan... or as modified through Master Plan approval. Flexibility in arrangement of uses and densities is permitted provided that the overall Master Plan is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density ranges... in the adopted Concept Plan.”

The rowhomes in this design review application, which were approved with the preliminary subdivision applications for Phases 1-3 will contribute to the overall density goal of 8.4 units per net acre for the Master Plan as a whole (i.e., all phases) and therefore is in substantial compliance with the area totals and density range.

(B) A Master Plan application may address the entirety of any expansion area individually or may combine expansion areas within the urban growth boundary (UGB).
Response: The Brynhill Master Plan application addressed the entire North Expansion Area, which is within the UGB. This application is to develop rowhomes in Phases 1-3 of the Master Plan area.

(C) A phasing plan shall be included with the submitted Master Plan for any expansion area. The phasing plan shall indicate the acreage of each proposed phase to be developed, the number of housing units and square footage of other development projected within the phase and the approximate timing of the construction of each phase. The phasing plan shall provide a reasonable sequence of development for the expansion area with regards to the transportation system, utilities and topography of the area as well as market conditions and development within the city as a whole. The Planning Commission shall approve the phasing plan as part of the Master Plan. Revisions to the phasing plan after Master Plan approval are permitted as reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

Response: Phases were reviewed and approved with the preliminary subdivision and master plan refinement applications for Brynhill Phases 1-3. This design review and master plan refinement application is specific to rowhomes and does not request any changes to phasing.

(D) Master plans shall have public spaces, such as a plaza, park, school or community square.

Response: The Brynhill Master Plan is approved for 5.21 acres of public parks and trails located throughout the site. This design review and master plan refinement application is specific to rowhomes and does not request any changes to public spaces.

(E) Garages, carports and accessory structures shall be accessed from the rear of the building via an alley where appropriate and feasible. If front access garages are proposed, the applicant must provide justification as to why rear access garages are not appropriate or feasible. A garage, carport, accessory dwelling or accessory structure shall not extend beyond the front building elevation of the principle structure by more than six feet.

Response: This design review and master plan refinement application is specific to rowhomes and does not request any changes to garages, carports, or accessory structures as approved with prior applications.

(F) A minimum of 10% of the single-family detached housing units proposed with a Master Plan shall be single-level construction, or as modified through the Master Plan review process.

Response: This design review and master plan refinement application is specific to rowhomes and does not request any changes to the single-level homes in Brynhill Phases 1-3.

(G) Commercial buildings shall be designed to front on pedestrian-friendly streets rather than parking lots or arterial roadways.

Response: The Phase 1 Preliminary Subdivision reserved 2.02 acres, which is designated for commercial/mixed-use development. This commercial area is beyond the boundary of this application, so it is not part of the design review and master plan refinement proposal. The area will be subject to a subsequent design review application.

155.261 PROCEDURE.
The following procedure shall be observed when a Master Plan proposal is submitted for consideration.
F. In the process of reviewing applications for individual phases within an approved Master Plan, the Commission may approve the refinements to the Master Plan. Refinements to the Master Plan are defined as:

1. Changes to the street network or functional classification of streets that do not significantly reduce circulation system function or connectivity for vehicles, bicycles or pedestrians.
   **Response:** The applicant does not request any master plan refinements to change the street network or functional classification of streets.

2. Changes to the nature or location of park type, trails, or open space that do not significantly reduce land area, function, livability, usability, connectivity, or overall distribution or availability of these uses in the Master Plan area.
   **Response:** The applicant does not request any master plan refinements to change the nature or location of park type, trails, or open space.

3. Changes to the location or mix of land uses, or configuration of individual lots or site plan elements, that do not significantly alter the overall distribution or availability of uses or density in the Master Plan area.
   **Response:** The applicant requests a master plan refinement to allow the interior rowhome units to allow them to exceed the maximum 80 percent lot coverage required for rowhomes (townhomes) in the NC zone. As detailed on typical lot plan (Site Plan Exhibit C), the smallest interior lots exceed the standard by 7%, with 87 percent lot coverage. Therefore, the applicant requests a 7 percent deviation (less than 10 percent of the standard) to support the proposed interior rowhome units. The plan remains in compliance with the density requirement for 8.4 units per net acre and the 70/30 detached versus attached housing mix.

G. Refinements meeting the above definition may be approved by the Commission upon finding that:

1. The refinement(s) will equally or better meet the conditions of the approved Master Plan.
   **Response:** The proposed Master Plan Refinement (allow interior rowhome lots to have 87% lot coverage) meets or improves upon the conditions of the approved Master Plan:
   - Changes to the street network or functional classification of streets
     This application does not propose changes to the street network or functional classification of streets.
   - Changes to the nature or location of park type, trails, or open space
     This application does not propose changes to the location of park type, trails, or open space.
   - Changes to the location or mix of land uses
     Allowing a 7 percent increase in the maximum lot coverage standard improves the Master Plan by allowing interior rowhomes that are compatible with the surrounding area (2-story homes that have 3-bedrooms and two-car garages). These are features typically reserved only for end units. This refinement will allow all proposed rowhome units (interior and end units) to be more marketable for families looking to buy in this community. This type of rowhome design is compatible with the size and style of homes.
in North Plains, but still provides for a diversity in home options within the Brynhill community that is consistent with the goals of the Master Plan. This refinement to allow 87% lot coverage for interior row home lots has no impact on the location or mix of land uses in the project.

2. The refinement will not preclude an adjoining phase from development consistent with the approved Master Plan.

**Response:** The refinement, as described above, does not request changes to street network, reductions to municipal park space, or changes to density that would preclude an adjoining phase from development consistent with the approved Master Plan.

Significant changes to an approved Master Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for processing as an amendment to an approved Master Plan. Significant changes would be defined as any change not covered by Subsection F (1-3) above.

**Response:** The refinement described above is not significant, it represents a less than 10 percent deviation from the standard and will equally meet the conditions of the Master Plan.
DUPLEX, TRIPLEX AND ATTACHED TWO SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS

155.487 STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.

The following standards and requirements shall govern the development of duplexes, triplexes and attached single-family dwellings.

(A) Minimum lot size. The minimum lot size of each dwelling unit shall be as specified by the base zone.

(B) Minimum building setbacks.

1. All setbacks shall comply with the setbacks required in the underlying zone; except that, for interior side yards with a common wall, the side setback shall be zero feet.

2. The location of all buildings shall comply with the vision clearance requirements of § 155.656 of this chapter.

Response: The Site Plan (Exhibit C) details the lot size and building dimensions for each rowhome homesite, in compliance with the rowhome (townhome) setback standards required by the NC zone.

(C) Design standards. These standards are intended to: control development scale; avoid or minimize impacts associated with traffic, parking and design compatibility; and ensure management and maintenance of common areas.

1. Building mass supplemental standard. The maximum number and width of consecutively attached townhouses (such as, with attached walls at property line) shall not exceed two units in the C-1 Zoning District and four units in the R-2.5 and R-5 Zoning Districts.

Response: The proposed rowhomes are in the NC zone. This standard is not applicable.

2. Alley access.

(a) Townhouse subdivisions (creation of four or more lots for single-family attached dwellings) shall receive vehicle access only from a rear alley. Alley(s) shall be created at the time of subdivision approval.

(b) Alleys are not required when development patterns or topography make construction of an alley impracticable.

(c) As necessary, the city shall require dedication of right-of-way or easements and construction of pathways between townhouse lots (for example, between building breaks) to provide for pedestrian connectivity.

3. Street access developments. Townhouses receiving access directly from a street shall comply with all of the following standards, in order to minimize interruption of adjacent sidewalks by driveway entrances, slow traffic, improve appearance of the streets, provide more on-street parking area and minimize paved surfaces for better storm water management.

(a) When garages face the street, they shall be flush with, or recessed behind, the front elevation (such as, living area or covered front porch).

(b) The maximum allowable curb cut and driveway apron width is 18 feet per dwelling unit. The remainder of the driveway facing the street may not exceed the width of the garage door, plus an additional four feet. The maximum combined garage width per unit is 50% of the total building width. For example, a 24-foot wide unit may have one 12-foot wide recessed garage facing the street.

(c) Two adjacent garages shall share one driveway when individual driveways would otherwise be separated by less than 20 feet (such as, the width of one on-street parking space). When a driveway serves more than one lot, the developer shall record an access
and maintenance easement/agreement to benefit each lot, prior to building permit issuance.

**Response:** All rowhomes will be served by an alley, which is 20 ft wide (19 ft of travel with a mountable curb). Each unit will have at the rear of the home a 2-car garage at that will be accessible from the alley.

(3) Common areas. Common areas (for example, landscaping in private tracts, shared driveways, private alleys and similar uses) shall be maintained by a homeowners association or other legal entity. A homeowners association may also be responsible for exterior building maintenance. A copy of any applicable covenants, restrictions and conditions shall be recorded and provided to the city prior to building permit approval.

**Response:** The master plan and preliminary subdivision applications detail the size, location, and function of all common areas throughout Brynhill Phases 1-3. This application is specific to the rowhome design review and does not propose any changes to the approved common areas.

(D) Standards for approval. Such uses shall may be permitted as a special use upon the following findings.

(1) The project shall comply with all other applicable provisions of this chapter.

**Response:** The applicant has demonstrated throughout this report that the proposed rowhome design review application complies with the provisions of this chapter.

(2) The project will accommodate the traffic generated by providing adequate off-street parking, access points and additional street right-of-way and improvements and other traffic facilities as required.

**Response:** This application is specific to the rowhome lots proposed in Brynhill Phases 1-3. There are no changes proposed that would alter compliance with prior decisions as related to traffic generation, off-street parking, access parking, and additional street right-of-way improvements.

(3) All public and private improvements shall be developed to applicable city public works standards.

**Response:** All public and private improvements will be developed to applicable city public works standards. Compliance with these standards will be detailed a subsequent stage of development with public works.

(4) Pedestrian walkways shall be provided for adequate pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

**Response:** This application is a specific to the rowhomes lots proposed in Brynhill Phases 1-3. There are no changes proposed that would alter compliance with prior decisions as related to pedestrian walkways. The Site Plan (Exhibit C) details how each rowhome unit will relate to the public pedestrian walkways throughout the development site.

(5) The overall housing density of the project shall comply with that permitted in the underlying R Zone.

**Response:** This application is in the NC zone, and as discussed earlier in this report, complies with the required 8.4 units/net acre.

(6) If proposed, private streets shall be owned and maintained by the owners of the lots which access the private street. A maintenance agreement shall be recorded which provides for the maintenance of the private street.
Response: The rowhomes will be served by private alleys that will be owned and maintained by and HOA. A maintenance agreement will be recorded with the final subdivision plat.

155.488 PROCEDURE.
(A) The development of attached single-family dwellings pursuant to this section shall require the approval of either a land partition or subdivision in order to create the 2,500 or 3,750 square foot legal lots of record.
(B) The proposed development shall comply with all applicable procedures and standards of either §§ 155.565 through 155.570 and 155.585 through 155.599 of this chapter.
(C) A development agreement specifying that subsequent development on the lots be limited to attached single-family dwellings shall also be required.
Response: Brynhill Phases 1-3 have received master plan and preliminary subdivision approval and a development agreement is in place. The proposed development complies with all applicable procedures of 155.565 through 155.570 and 155.585 through 155.599 of this chapter.

155.656 CLEAR VISION AREAS.
Except in the C-1 Zone, a clear vision area shall be maintained on the corners of all property adjacent to the intersection of two streets, a street and a railroad or a driveway providing vehicular access to a public street, including alleys.
(A) Lots or parcels on street corners (public and/or private) shall maintain a sight triangle with no sight obstruction between three feet and ten feet in height as measured from street grade. Sight obstructions include, but are not limited to, fences, vegetation, berms, signs and structures. The sight triangle shall be measured from the street corner (apex), to a distance of 20 feet along each street side. (See Figure 1.) For the purpose of this section, a STREET CORNER is defined as that point where the extended edges of the road surface of two intersecting streets meet. The city may require additional vision clearance based on a hazard identified by the city. However, tree trunks and sign poles not exceeding 12 inches in diameter may be located within the vision clearance area; provided, the diameter does not exceed 24 inches.
(B) A private access shall be treated as a public street for the purpose of this section. The vision clearance area shall be determined in the manner set forth form herein. The edge of the paved surface area of the private access, be it roadway, curb or sidewalk, shall be treated as the right-of-way line in determining the vision clearance area.
Response: No construction on residential lots or parcels that would create any sight obstruction is proposed with this application. Compliance with this Section will be addressed through subsequent construction plans.
OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING

155.673 AUTOMOTIVE PARKING REQUIREMENTS.

(A) Residential.

(1) Detached single-family*: two spaces per dwelling unit;

(2) Duplexes and triplexes*: one and one-half spaces per dwelling unit;

(3) Multi-family dwellings and attached single-family dwellings*:
   (a) Studio units or one-bedroom units: one space per dwelling unit;
   (b) Two-bedroom units: 1.75 spaces per dwelling unit;
   (c) Three-bedroom units: two spaces per dwelling unit;

Response: The Parking Plan in the preliminary subdivision applications for Brynhill Phases 1-3 demonstrated compliance with the parking requirements. Each unit will have three-bedrooms and each unit will have a two-car garage to meet the “two space per dwelling unit” parking requirement.

155.674 OFF-STREET LOADING REQUIREMENTS.

Off-street loading space shall be provided as listed below.

(A) All office buildings shall require a minimum loading space size of 12 feet wide, 20 feet long and 14 feet high in the following amounts: for buildings containing up to 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, one space; for each additional 10,000 square feet of gross floor area, or any portion thereof, one space.

(B) All other commercial or industrial buildings shall require a minimum loading space of 12 feet wide, 20 feet long and 14 feet high in the following amounts: for buildings containing up to 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, one space; for each additional 10,000 square feet of gross floor area, or any portion thereof, one space.

Response: This development does not propose office buildings, but the mixed-use area would be subject the off-street loading requirements.

155.675 PARKING AND LOADING AREA DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS.

Response: No public parking or loading areas were proposed with the Master Plan. NP

155.676 BICYCLE PARKING FACILITIES.

Response: The NPDC requires bicycle parking for all multi-family, commercial, institutional, and industrial uses. This design review application proposes attached single-family uses, and therefore is not subject to the Bicycle Parking Facility standards of this section. However, each individual unit includes a 2-car garage that will allow for adequate bike storage for residents.
CONCLUSION

The applicant has demonstrated compliance with the City of North Plains Zoning and Development Code and requests design review and master plan refinement approval for the proposed rowhomes located in Brynhill Phases 1-3. Specifically, the applicant requested a master plan refinement for interior rowhome units to have a maximum lot coverage of 87 percent. The refinement is not significant and will allow interior rowhomes to have three bedrooms and a two-car garages, providing an attached housing option that is compatible with the size and style of homes in North Plains. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests approval of master plan refinement and design review for rowhomes in Brynhill Phases 1-3.
BRYNHILL PHASES 1-3

SITE INFORMATION

PHASE AREA
- PHASE 1 = 1,045,440 SF
- PHASE 2 = 439,956 SF
- PHASE 3 = 710,028 SF
- TOTAL = 2,195,424 SF (50.4 ACRES)

ROWHOME COVERED AREA
- LOTS 1-18 = 18,630 SF
- LOTS 19-37 = 19,715 SF
- LOTS 38-45 = 8,230 SF
- LOTS 129-137 = 9,315 SF
- LOTS 225-233 = 9,315 SF
- LOTS 295-302 = 8,230 SF
- TOTAL = 73,435 SF (1.69 ACRES)

% OF ROWHOME SITE COVERAGE

73,435 SF / 2,195,424 SF = 3.34%

TYPICAL ROWHOME LOT PLAN (INTERIOR UNIT, 72% LOT COVERAGE)

TYPICAL ROWHOME LOT PLAN (EXTERIOR UNIT, 87% LOT COVERAGE)
Date:       June 21, 2021
To:         Mayor and City Council
From:       City Manager Andy Varner
Subject:    Resolution 2154: Adopting a Capital Improvement Plan for the Fiscal Years 2022 - 2027

Request:   Adopt Resolution 2154 to Adopt a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Fiscal Years 2022 - 2027

Background: The City has capital improvement programs for each of our currently adopted System Master Plans in Water, Parks, and Transportation. In addition, we have capital projects related to facilities (city hall/police, library, public works) and a newly created pavement management index that develops a schedule of road surface improvement projects.

All of the short/Immediate term projects have been inserted into a Master CIP list for the City of North Plains for the fiscal years 2022 – 2027, to align with three biennial budget cycles. Each individual project has its own details sheet, cost estimate, and identified funding source.

The Draft CIP list attached to the resolution is substantively the same as what the Council saw at its June 7, 2021 work session.

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 2154.

Goal Association: This project relates to Improving + Expanding Community Facilities to accommodate the service level expectations of a growing community.

Fiscal Impact: None related to this resolution. System Development Charge updates may come at a later date based on the inputs of this plan.


Sample Motion: I move to adopt Resolution 2154 to Adopt a Capital Improvement Plan for the Fiscal Years 2022 – 2027.

Attachments:   Resolution 2154
               FY 2022 – 2027 Capital Improvement Plan
RESOLUTION NO. 2154
A RESOLUTION OF THE NORTH PLAINS CITY COUNCIL ADOPTING
UPDATES TO THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, Resolution 2031 was adopted on February 19, 2019 and established Goals
and Priorities developed by the North Plains City Council (“City Council”); and

WHEREAS, one of the goals established was to develop and adopt updates to the City’s
Capital Improvement Plan to meet the growing infrastructure needs of the community; and

WHEREAS, ORS 223.309(1) requires the City to prepare a capital improvement plan,
public facilities plan, master plan or comparable plan (“CIP”) that includes a list of the
capital improvements the City intends to fund primarily with System Development
Charges assessed and collected in accordance with ORS 223.297 to 223.314; and

WHEREAS, ORS 223.309(2) authorizes the City to modify its CIP at any time, without
the notice and hearing requirements otherwise imposed by ORS 223.309(2), when SDC
charges will not be increased by the proposed modification; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Capital Improvement Plan update and summary attached
hereto as Exhibit A has been reviewed by the City Council.

Now, therefore,

THE CITY OF NORTH PLAINS RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The updated Capital Improvement Plan attached hereto as Exhibit A is
hereby adopted.

Section 2. This resolution is effective immediately upon adoption.

INTRODUCED AND ADOPTED this _________ day of ________________, 2021.

CITY OF NORTH PLAINS, OREGON

BY: ______________________________
    Teri Lenahan, Mayor

ATTEST:

BY: ______________________________
    Lori Lesmeister, City Recorder
Fiscal Years 2022 -2027
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
### CITY OF NORTH PLAINS CAPITAL PROJECT SUMMARY

**STREETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pg. #</th>
<th>CIP #</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>2022 - 2023</th>
<th>2024 - 2025</th>
<th>2026 - 2027</th>
<th>CIP Total</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ST.001</td>
<td>Main Street - Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>$710,000</td>
<td>$710,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ST.002</td>
<td>Main Street at Commercial Street - Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Street / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ST.003</td>
<td>Glencoe Road at Commercial Street - Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ST.004</td>
<td>Commercial Street at 311th Avenue - Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Street / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ST.005</td>
<td>Main Street - Bike Lane Improvements</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>Street / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ST.006</td>
<td>West Union Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>$1,287,000</td>
<td>$1,287,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ST.007</td>
<td>Glencoe Road &amp; West Union Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ST.008</td>
<td>Glencoe Sidewalk Improvements and Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ST.009</td>
<td>East Cottage Street Overlay</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond / SCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ST.010</td>
<td>Ghost Creek Trail Boardwalk Improvement</td>
<td>$615,000</td>
<td>$615,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ST.011</td>
<td>Pacific Street - Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ST.012</td>
<td>311th Ave Sidewalk Improvement and Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ST.013</td>
<td>309th Ave Sidewalk Improvement</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ST.014</td>
<td>Jessie Mays Park Perimeter Sidewalk Improvement</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ST.015</td>
<td>East Hillcrest Street Overlay</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ST.016</td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements on Commercial Street</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ST.017</td>
<td>NW Cottage Street Improvement</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ST.018</td>
<td>313th Avenue - Pedestrian Improvements (Pacific to Highland)</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond / Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ST.019</td>
<td>North Avenue</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
<td>Priv/Street / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ST.020</td>
<td>Yorkshire Street - Traffic Calming</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Street/Priv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ST.021</td>
<td>North @ Main Street - Raised Intersection</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>Priv/Street / TDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ST.022</td>
<td>Pavement Overlay/Repair</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Streets / SCA /MSTIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ST.023</td>
<td>313th Avenue - Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond/Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ST.024</td>
<td>Main Street at Lenox Street - Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ST.025</td>
<td>Pacific Street at 313th Avenue - Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>Transportation Bond/Street/Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ST.026</td>
<td>Glencoe Road at Pacific Street - Signal</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>Street / TDT/County/URA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ST.027</td>
<td>Kaybern Street - Pedestrian Infill Improvements</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ST.028</td>
<td>Glencoe Road at Commercial Street - Roundabout</td>
<td>$1,420,000</td>
<td>$1,420,000</td>
<td>Street / TDT/County/URA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ST.029</td>
<td>Glencoe Road at Highland Court - Restrict movements</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>Street / TDT/County/URA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ST.030</td>
<td>Glencoe Road at Highland Court - Street Connection east of Main</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STREETS CIP TOTAL** | **$8,553,000** | **$1,460,000** | **$2,500,000**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pg. #</th>
<th>CIP #</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>2022 - 2023</th>
<th>2024 - 2025</th>
<th>2026 - 2027</th>
<th>CIP Total</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>WA.001</td>
<td>8&quot; Waterline Upgrade on Main (Commercial to Cottage)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>WA.002</td>
<td>8&quot; Waterline Upgrade on 309th (North to Alley)</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>WA.003</td>
<td>8&quot; Waterline Upgrade on 311th (Wascoe to Hillcrest)</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>WA.004</td>
<td>8&quot; Waterline Upgrade on Cottage (Main to 311 &amp; 309 to Glencoe)</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>WA.005</td>
<td>8&quot; Waterline Upgrade on 313th (North to Hillcrest)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$355,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>WA.006</td>
<td>8&quot; Waterline Upgrade on Kaybern (311th to 318th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>WA.007</td>
<td>New Reservoir (2 MG) &amp; PS</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>WA.008</td>
<td>Potable Pillow Tanks</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>WA.009</td>
<td>Aquifer Storage and Recovery Feasibility Study</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>WA.010</td>
<td>UE2A - New 10&quot; Waterline on NW Hillcrest (319th to Main)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>WA.011</td>
<td>UE2B - New 12&quot; Waterline on NW Hillcrest W. of 319th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WATER CIP TOTAL</td>
<td>$4,225,000</td>
<td>$655,000</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>FA.001</td>
<td>Public Works Facility</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>FA.002</td>
<td>City Hall, Library, &amp; Public Safety Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,525,000</td>
<td>$21,525,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bond/URA/PPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACILITIES CIP TOTAL</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$21,525,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>PA.001</td>
<td>Jesse Mays Community Park</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks Capital/Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>PA.002</td>
<td>Pacific Purple Park</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks Capital/Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>PA.003</td>
<td>McKay Creek Trail Development</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PA.004</td>
<td>Trail Corridor Maintenance</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PA.005</td>
<td>Park minor repairs &amp; renovations</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PA.006</td>
<td>Park ADA Compliance Upgrades</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARKS CIP TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2022-2027 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN TOTALS | $18,373,000 | $4,925,000 | $25,095,000 | $48,393,000 |

**Acronyms**

- N/A - Individual project sheet not required
- TDT - Transportation Development Tax
- Priv - Private Funds
- URA - Urban Renewal Agency
- PPP - Private Public Partnership
- SDC - System Development Charges
- SCA - Small Cities Allotment
- MSTIP - Major Streets Transportation Improvements Program
Main Street – Pedestrian Improvements

Project ID: ST.001
Project Type: Sidewalks
Project Details: Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter & Crosswalks
Funding Source: Transportation Bond / TDT

Description: Installation of approximately 2,000 lineal feet of curb, detached sidewalks, planter strips and connections to the existing storm main on Main Street between Commercial and Pacific Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $710,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements

**Cost does not include any potential ROW & TCE acquisitions
Main Street at Commercial Street – Crossing Improvements

Project ID: ST.002
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvements
Project Details: Crosswalk Striping
Funding Source: Street / TDT

Description: Installation of striping for a Level 2 Standard Crosswalk on all four crossings of the intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Design &amp; Permitting</th>
<th>$3,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $10,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Glencoe Road at Commercial Street – Crossing Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID:</th>
<th>ST.003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Details:</td>
<td>Crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source:</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Installation of Level 3 High Visibility Crossing across the south side of Glencoe Road for improved access from east side to downtown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $10,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

[Map of Glencoe Road at Commercial Street – Crossing Improvements]
Commercial Street at 311th Street – Crossing Improvements

Project ID: ST.004
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvements
Funding Source: Street / TDT

Description: Installation of striping for a Level 2 Standard Crosswalk on all 4 crossings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding: $10,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Main Street – Bike Lane Improvements

Project ID: ST.005
Project Type: Bikeway Improvements
Project Details: Shared Roadway
Funding Source: Street / TDT

Description: Installation of bicycle pavement markings for a shared roadway facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding: $16,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
West Union Pedestrian Improvements

Project ID: ST.006
Project Type: Sidewalk
Project Details: Shared Pathway
Funding Source: Transportation Bond / TDT

Description: Provide additional pavement and boardwalk width along the West Union Pedestrian Improvement project to allow for a multi-use path.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,127,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding: $1,287,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Intersection Improvement at Glencoe Road and West Union Road

Project ID: ST.007
Project Type: Sidewalk
Project Details: Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter, Crosswalk
Funding Source: Transportation Bond

Description: Installation of approximately 125 lineal feet of Sidewalk along the north side of NW Commercial Street, ADA corner improvements to 3 corners of NW West Union and NW Glencoe Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding: $100,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
**Glencoe Road Sidewalk Improvements and Railroad Crossing**

Project ID: ST.008  
Project Type: Sidewalk  
Project Details: Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter & Crosswalks  
Funding Source: Transportation Bond / TDT

**Description:** Installation of approximately 550 lineal feet of sidewalk, curb and gutter, and storm improvements on the west side of Glencoe Road between Commercial Street and North Avenue, with a new attached level sidewalk railroad crossing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $255,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Location Map](image-url)
**East Cottage Street Overlay**

Project ID: ST.009  
Project Type: Street  
Project Details: Pavement Rehab  
Funding Source: Transportation Bond / Small Cities Allotment

**Description:** Approximately 52,000 square feet of pavement surfacing overlay of Cottage Street from Main street to Glencoe Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding**  
$250,000

*Cost based on previous projects in the City of North Plains

**Location:**

![Map of East Cottage Street Overlay](image-url)
**Ghost Creek Trail Boardwalk Improvement**

Project ID: ST.010  
Project Type: Sidewalk  
Project Details: Sidewalk and Boardwalk  
Funding Source: Transportation Bond

**Description:** Installation of approximately 500 lineal feet of Sidewalk or Boardwalk along Ghost Creek.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $615,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map of Ghost Creek Trail Boardwalk Improvement Project](image-url)
**Pedestrian Improvements on Pacific Street**

**Project ID:** ST.011  
**Project Type:** Sidewalk  
**Project Details:** Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter & Crosswalks  
**Funding Source:** Transportation Bond / TDT

**Description:** Installation of approximately 1,850 lineal feet of curb & gutter, sidewalk, and storm system improvements on the north side of Pacific Street between Main Street and NW 309th Avenue, with existing sidewalk from NW 309th Avenue to Glencoe Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $650,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map of Pacific Street area showing project location]
**311th Avenue Sidewalk Improvement and Railroad Crossing**

Project ID: ST.012  
Project Type: Sidewalk  
Project Details: Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter & Crosswalks  
Funding Source: Transportation Bond

**Description:** Installation of approximately 350 lineal feet of Sidewalk, curb & gutter, and storm improvements on the east side of 311th Avenue between Commercial Street and Hillcrest Street, with an attached level sidewalk railroad crossing at the existing concrete pad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding:** $135,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

---
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309th Avenue Sidewalk Improvement

Project ID: ST.013
Project Type: Sidewalks
Project Details: Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter & Crosswalks
Funding Source: Transportation Bond

**Description:** Installation of approximately 575 lineal feet of Sidewalk, curb & gutter, and storm improvements on the west side of 309th Avenue between Wascoe Street and North Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $200,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**
Jessie Mays Park Perimeter Sidewalk Improvement

Project ID: ST.014
Project Type: Sidewalks
Project Details: Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter & Crosswalks
Funding Source: Transportation Bond

Description: Installation of approximately 1400 lineal feet of Sidewalk, curb & gutter, and storm improvements around Jessie Mays Park; on Wascoe Street, 311th Avenue, Hillcrest Street, and 309th Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements

**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
**East Hillcrest Street Overlay**

Project ID: ST.015  
Project Type: Street  
Project Details: Pavement Rehab  
Funding Source: Transportation Bond

**Description:** Approximately 58,000 square feet of pavement surfacing overlay on NW Hillcrest Street from Main Street to Glencoe Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $280,000

*Cost based on previous projects in the City of North Plains*

**Location:**

![Map of East Hillcrest Street Overlay](image-url)
**Pedestrian Improvements on Commercial Street**

*Project ID: ST.016
Project Type: Sidewalks
Project Details: Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter & Crosswalks
Funding Source: Transportation Bond / TDT*

**Description:** Installation of approximately 710 lineal feet of Sidewalk, curb & gutter, and storm improvements on the north side of Commercial Street between 311th and 314th, crosswalk signal improvements at 314th and Main.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design &amp; Permitting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $270,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map of Commercial Street Area]
**NW Cottage Street Improvement**

Project ID:  ST.017
Project Type:  Street
Project Details: Pavement, Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter & Crosswalks
Funding Source: Transportation Bond

**Description:** Installation of a ¾ Street improvement, approximately 650 lineal feet of Pavement, Sidewalk along the north side, curb & gutter, and storm improvements between NW 321st Ave. and NW 324th Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding**  $390,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements

**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map of NW Cottage Street Improvement]
**313th Avenue - Pedestrian Improvements (Pacific to Highland)**

**Project ID:** ST.018  
**Project Type:** Pedestrian Improvements  
**Project Details:** Sidewalk  
**Funding Source:** Transportation Bond/Street

**Description:** Installation of approximately 700 lineal feet of sidewalk and curb & gutter along the west side of NW 313th Avenue between NW Pacific Street and NW Highland Court, connecting to Vern Galloway Memorial Park to the south.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design &amp; Permitting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding**  
$315,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Location Map]
North Avenue

Project ID: ST.019
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvements
Project Details: Sidewalk
Funding Source: Priv/Street/TDT

Description: Installation of sidewalk and curb and gutter infill along both sides of NW North Avenue from NW Glencoe Road to NW Gordon Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$990,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $1,260,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Yorkshire Street – Traffic Calming

Project ID: ST.020
Project Type: Vehicular Improvements
Project Details: Traffic Calming
Funding Source: Street/Priv

Description: Installation of traffic devices to reduce cut through traffic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $100,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
North Avenue at Main Street – Raised Intersection

Project ID: ST.021
Project Type: Vehicular Improvements
Project Details: Roadway, Crosswalks
Funding Source: Private/Street/TDT

Description: Installation of a raised intersection and pedestrian crosswalks at the NW North main Avenue and NW Main Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $975,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
313th Avenue – Pedestrian Improvements

Project ID: ST.023
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvements
Project Details: Sidewalk
Funding Source: Transportation Bond/Street

Description: Installation of approximately 400 lineal feet of sidewalk and curb & gutter along one side of NW 313th Avenue between NW Hillcrest Street and NW Lenox Street, and a crosswalk at NW Wascoe Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design &amp; Permitting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $200,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Main Street at Lenox Street – Crossing Improvements

Project ID: ST.024
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvements
Project Details: Crosswalk Striping
Funding Source: Street

Description: Installation of striping for a Level 2 Standard Crosswalk on south side of Main Street. North side crossing on Main Street already exists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $10,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Pacific Street at 313th Street – Crossing Improvements

Project ID: ST.025
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvements
Project Details: Crosswalk Striping
Funding Source: Street/TDT

Description: Installation of striping for a Level 2 Standard Crosswalk on all 4 crossings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting: $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration: $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction: $5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding: $10,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
311th Avenue – Pedestrian Improvements

Project ID: ST.026
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvements
Project Details: Sidewalk
Funding Source: Transportation Bond/Street/Grant

Description: Installation of approximately 1,000 lineal feet of sidewalk and curb and gutter along one side of NW 311th Avenue between NW Pacific Street and NW Commercial Street. Includes storm sewer improvements as well as crosswalks at cross streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $390,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Glencoe Road at Pacific Street - Signal

Project ID: ST.027
Project Type: Vehicular Improvements
Project Details: Traffic Signal
Funding Source: Street/TDT/County/URA

Description: Installation of traffic signal at the intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $650,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Kaybern Street – Pedestrian Infill Improvements

Project ID: ST.028
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvements
Project Details: Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter
Funding Source: Street

Description: Installation of missing sidewalk segments on one side of NW Kaybern St. between NW 309th Avenue and NW 318th Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $525,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Glencoe Road at Commercial Street – Roundabout

Project ID: ST.029
Project Type: Vehicular Improvements
Project Details: Roundabout or Traffic Signal
Funding Source: Street/TDT/County/URA

Description: Final intersection improvements consisting of installation of roundabout or traffic signal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,420,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Glencoe Road at Highland Court – Restrict Movements

**Project ID:** ST.030  
**Project Type:** Vehicular Improvements  
**Project Details:** Signage  
**Funding Source:** Street/TDT/County/URA

**Description:** Installing signage to restrict traffic movements at intersection. Restriction includes eliminating the left turn out of Highland Court, while still allowing right turns out and the left turn into Highland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding**  
$280,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**
**Wascoe Street – Street Connection East of Main**

**Project ID:** ST.031  
**Project Type:** Vehicular Improvements  
**Project Details:** Road Continuation  
**Funding Source:** Street

**Description:** Installation of new roadway from Main Street 80’ east of Main Street connecting to existing roadway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding**  
$75,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map of the area showing the Street Connection East of Main and Wascoe Street.](map_image)
8" Waterline Upgrade on Main (Commercial to Cottage)

Project ID: WA.001
Project Type: Waterline Improvements
Project Details: Waterline Upgrades
Funding Source: Water SDC

Description: Replacing existing 6” diameter waterline with an 8” diameter waterline in NW Main Street approximately 520 lineal feet from NW Commercial Street to NW Cottage Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $200,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for waterline improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:

![Map of the area showing the location of the waterline upgrade project.](image-url)
8" Waterline Upgrade on 309th (North to Alley)

Project ID: WA.002
Project Type: Waterline Improvements
Project Details: Waterline Upgrades
Funding Source: Water SDC

Description: Replacing existing 4" diameter waterline with an 8" diameter waterline in NW 309th Avenue approximately 340 lineal feet from NW North Avenue to the midblock alley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $160,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for waterline improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
**8" Waterline Upgrade on 311th (Wascoe to Hillcrest)**

Project ID: WA.003  
Project Type: Waterline Improvements  
Project Details: Waterline Upgrades  
Funding Source: Water SDC

**Description:** Replacing existing 4” diameter waterline with an 8” diameter waterline in NW 311th Avenue approximately 260 lineal feet from NW Wascoe Street to NW Hillcrest Street Avenue to the midblock alley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $110,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for waterline improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map of the area showing the upgrade location](image-url)
**8" Waterline Upgrade on Cottage (Main to 311 & 309 to Glencoe)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID:</th>
<th>WA.004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Waterline Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Details:</td>
<td>Waterline Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source:</td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Replacing existing 4” diameter waterline with an 8” diameter waterline in NW Cottage Street approximately 1400 lineal feet from NW Main Street to NW 311th Avenue and approximately 390 lineal feet from NW 309th Avenue to NW Glencoe Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** | $630,000 |

*Cost based on previous public works projects for waterline improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map of project location]
8" Waterline Upgrade on 313th (North to Hillcrest)

Project ID: WA.005
Project Type: Waterline Improvements
Project Details: Waterline Upgrades
Funding Source: Water SDC

Description: Replacing existing 6" diameter waterline with an 8" diameter waterline in NW 313th Avenue approximately 920 lineal feet from NW North Avenue to NW Hillcrest Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $355,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for waterline improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
8" Waterline Upgrade on Kaybern (311th to 318th)

Project ID: WA.006  
Project Type: Waterline Improvements  
Project Details: Waterline Upgrades  
Funding Source: Water SDC

Description: Replacing existing 6” diameter waterline with an 8” diameter waterline in NW Kaybern Street approximately 1900 lineal feet from NW 311th Avenue to NW 318th Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding: $700,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for waterline improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
**New Reservoir (2 MG) & PS**

Project ID: WA.007  
Project Type: Water Improvements  
Project Details: Water Storage Facilities  
Funding Source: Water Fund

**Description:** Installation of a new 2 million-gallon (MG) water reservoir and associated pump station to address the approximated future water storage deficiency within the City. This CIP includes construction of the facilities only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Project Funding | $3,000,000 |

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**
**UE2A - New 10" Waterline on NW Hillcrest (319th to Main)**

**Project ID:** WA.010  
**Project Type:** Waterline Improvements  
**Project Details:** New Waterline  
**Funding Source:** Water SDC

**Description:** Installation of approximately 970 lineal feet of new 10 inch water main within NW Hillcrest west of NW 319th between NW 319th and NW Main St for fire flow and distribution improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design &amp; Permitting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** | $300,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map of NW Hillcrest area showing project location]
**UE2B - New 12" Waterline on NW Hillcrest W. of 319th**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID:</th>
<th>WA.011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Waterline Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Details:</td>
<td>New Waterline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source:</td>
<td>Water SDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Installation of approximately 910 lineal feet of new 12 inch water main within NW Hillcrest west of NW 319th for fire flow and distribution improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Funding** $325,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements

**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

**Location:**

![Map showing the location of the waterline project](map.jpg)
Public Works Facility

Project ID: FA.001
Project Type: Facility Improvements
Funding Source: Bond

Description: Construction of a new Public Works Facility building to allow for enough space for Public Works staff, equipment, and materials to keep pace with a growing City population as well as a separated location from City Hall and the City Library. The new facility will be located at the existing reservoir site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting $1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration     $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction       $5,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $7,200,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:

![Location Image]
City Hall, Library, & Public Safety Facility

Project ID: FA.002
Project Type: Facility Improvements
Funding Source: Bond/URA/PPP

Description: Construction of a new Civic Center for City Hall, Library & Public Safety staff and facilities to allow for enough space to keep pace with a growing City population as well as address privacy and safety concerns for Public Safety staff. This will be an expansion of the current City facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$3,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$16,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding: $21,525,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Jesse Mays Community Park

Project ID: PA.001  
Project Type: Park Improvements  
Project Details: Safety, Resurfacings, Pathways, Building Renovation  
Funding Source: Parks Capital/Grants

Description: Replace safety fall surfacing at the playground, resurface the tennis and basketball courts, renovate the existing community building and integrate new access pathways with existing park amenities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements  
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
Pacific Purple Park

Project ID: PA.002
Project Type: Park Improvements
Project Details: Picnic Shelter
Funding Source: Parks Capital/Grants

Description: Installation of elevated play structure above the flood zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding: $200,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for street improvements
**Cost does not include any potential ROW or TCE acquisitions

Location:
McKay Creek Trail Development

Project ID: PA.003
Project Type: Park Improvements
Project Details: Trail Paths
Funding Source: Parks Capital

Description: Installation of a pedestrian trail and/or elevated boardwalk along portions of the McKay Creek corridor between the south end of NW 306th Place to an existing trail west of the intersection of NW 307th Avenue and NW Highland Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Funding $1,450,000

*Cost based on previous public works projects for pedestrian path improvements

Location:
Date: June 7, 2021  
To: Honorable Mayor and City Council  
From: Andy Varner, City Manager  
Subject: City Manager Staff Report

Plans/Projects/Programs

• Last week Washington County reached the level where 70% of those 16 and older had received at least one COVID-19 vaccine dose, and the state of Oregon is getting close. Once the statewide 70% threshold is reached Governor Brown will eliminate virtually all of the risk level restrictions. The Governor previously indicated that June 25 is her target for eliminating restrictions. A decision for Council will be whether to reinstate water utility shut-offs and late fees. The State’s eviction moratorium is also due to lapse at the end of June.

• In order for smaller communities like ours to receive American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds the State of Oregon must first request the appropriation from the Treasury Department. The State then has up to 30 days to distribute those funds to local jurisdictions. Thus far, Oregon has not made that request to the Federal government. I have put in requests to our Legislators and Regional Solutions representative to find out what is holding up the Governor/Legislature from making this request.

• By now you should have seen information for the planned Independence Day Celebration on July 4th. There will be a parade that morning, using the same parade route as in 2020. Pumpkin Ridge Golf Club will host the fireworks and open their doors to the community later that afternoon. They will open their venue up to the public several hours in advance of the show for games, food, beverages, and more. The City and NPEA will partner on the parade and some of the logistics at Pumpkin Ridge.

• We received $6M+ in obligation bonds last week for our transportation bond projects. Receiving a favorable interest (and thus lower debt service payments) has allowed us to squeeze in a couple modest projects into our improvement schedule.

• Staff will investigate options to receive Council feedback on the Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) update we need to do in conjunction with the UGB study. As the Mayor’s previous email indicated, we would ideally have a vision and direction to move forward with by the end of August, to have a contractor working in September.

• We are starting the clearing and grubbing behind Bartlett Loop for the McKay Creek Trail connector between the West Union Pedestrian Path and the Turtle Pond. This summer we will get the easement areas surveyed and start working toward the trail design.

• The Parks Board is interested in naming two new parks in North Plains and would like to take on that task, with the Council’s consent. We have permission from Taylor Morrison to name the larger Sunset Ridge II Park before taking over control in 2024, and Lennar has
agreed to partner with the city to name the **Phase I Brynhill park** (even though HOA maintained). Ultimately the Council would approve the park name in Sunset Ridge (because it will be City-owned and maintained), but in Brynhill that is not a requirement; they are open to working with the Board. I have attached the City’s Park and Plaque Naming Policy at the end of my report for review. It could use an update at some point too. 😊 I might come forward with a recommendation or two.

**Urban Renewal Agency**

- The **Glencoe Opportunity Area (GOA)** developer RFP was issued on June 2, with a response deadline of July 23. Staff held a Pre-Proposal Conference on June 15 over Zoom. We had more than a dozen attendees. Those interested can view the RFP at [https://www.northplains.org/bc-urab/page/glencoe-opportunity-area-redevelopment](https://www.northplains.org/bc-urab/page/glencoe-opportunity-area-redevelopment). Bill Reid had a nice article in the paper right after that meeting!
- We received the Notice to Proceed from the State for the **Downtown Improvement Plan** last week, so work can finally commence. We’ll have an on-site kick-off meeting and walk through the downtown corridor within a couple weeks with the entire project team.

**Grants**

- Here is a rundown of all the grants we have in the air or are preparing:
  - The City will use the pavement management program index to determine a suitable improvement candidate for a **Small Cities Allotment** application at the end of July.

************

**Boards/Commissions/Meetings**

**Economic Development Committee**

- July 7: Postponed. Enjoy the month!

**Parks & Recreation Board**

- July 12: No topics as of writing; meeting potentially postponed.

**Planning Commission**

- July 14: Zoning Code updates

**Three Meeting Outlook for City Council**

- The next few **City Council meeting agendas** should include: Brynhill Phase II Development Agreement.
Council Work Sessions
The Council agreed to convene for City Council meeting work sessions on the first meeting of each month (and sometimes the second). I would welcome Council feedback, but future work session dates and potential topics I foresee include:

July : TBD
CITY OF NORTH PLAINS
PARK NAMING AND PLAQUE POLICY

Purpose
The purpose of the policy is to establish consistent standard procedures and guidelines for the
naming of public park lands owned and/or operated by the City of North Plains. The renaming
of parks is strongly discouraged.

Policy
The naming of City parks, park areas and park facilities shall be the function of the City Council,
with opportunities for community comment at public forums. City Council has final authority to
approve or amend any recommendation. Diversity, balance and creativity will be sought during
adoption of names.

Objectives
1. Provide name identification for individual parks, park areas or park facilities.

2. Provide criteria for the process of naming parks, park areas or park facilities.

3. Provide opportunities for public input including a public gatherings or meetings.

4. Ensure that the naming of parks, park areas, or park facilities is controlled by the City
Council.

Criteria
The naming of parks, park areas, and park facilities should be approached with caution, patience,
and deliberation. Names submitted for consideration should provide some form of individual
identity in relation to the following:

1. The geographic location of the facility; this includes descriptive names.

2. An outstanding feature of the facility.

3. An adjoining subdivision, street, school, or natural feature. No park shall be given the
same name as an existing school site or public facility, except where the sites abut one
another.

4. A commonly recognized historical event, group, organization or individual (living or
deceased).

5. An individual or organization that contributed significantly to the acquisition or
development of the facility to be named. This can include either a deed or substantial
monetary contribution, or contribution toward acquisition and/or development of the park
or park facility (typically not less than 50 percent of the value of the property or improvements).

6. Outstanding accomplishments by an individual for the good of the community. Quality of the contribution should be considered along with the length of service by the individual – this to be fully substantiated by person making recommendation.

7. Any individual who provided an exceptional service in the interest of the park system as a whole.

8. Typically, while serving in a public office, public officials should not be considered as a candidate for naming.

**Donated Land**
Parks and park facilities that are donated to the City can be named by deed restriction by the donor. The naming and acceptance of land is subject to recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by City Council. Naming rights are not guaranteed if the donation of park land is a dedication as required by the Subdivision Ordinance (park land dedication).

**Naming Process**
Public Works staff will notify the Council about naming opportunities. The recommendation of staff will be subject to final approval or amendment by City Council action.

1. **Temporary Naming**
   In the case of a new project, a temporary name will be designated by the City staff for identification during acquisition and/or development of the park area or park facility. Because temporary designations tend to be retained, the naming process for a new park should be carried out as quickly as possible after its acquisition or development.

2. **Permanent Naming**
   Citizen involvement in the naming process is encouraged and may be accomplished in a variety of ways throughout the naming process.

   A. Individuals, groups and/or organizations interested in proposing a name for an existing un-named park area or park facility may do so in writing using a “Park Naming Form” that outlines the naming criteria. These will be presented to City Council.

   B. A variety of means to encourage public participation to submit a name (citizen contests, recommendations from previous owners, historical review of the site, etc.) may be implemented by staff at the request of the City Council. The “Park Naming Form” will be available through the City web site and at City Hall

   C. The City Council will accept public comment when considering park names.
3. Park Renaming

Critical examination will be conducted to ensure that renaming the park will not diminish the original justification for the name or the prior contributors. Renaming will follow the same procedures as naming the park.

A. Only parks and facilities named for geographic location, outstanding feature or subdivision should be considered for renaming. Parks that have been named by deed restriction shall not be considered for renaming.

B. Parks and facilities named after individuals shall not be changed unless it is found that because of the individual’s character the continued use of their name would not be in the best interest of the community.

Signage Process

The Public Works Director shall be responsible for the oversight and signage of City parks. Signage shall be installed for the two following types of parks:

1. General City Parks

   A maximum sign size of 24 inches by 18 inches, in green and white metal sign shall be placed in the entryway to each general City Park. The sign shall display the City’s logo in color as well as indicate the park name and state City Park.

2. Memorial Park Plaques

   A 10 inch by 20 inch cast plaque may be placed in memorial parks if donated to the City. The name shall be in 60 point Arial font, the years shall be in 50 point font and the individual’s information shall be in 41 point font. The individual information shall be obtained from the memorialized person’s family or organization. The plaques shall be placed on a rock surface.

City Park directional signage shall be placed on the main intersection of the street on which the City park is situated.

Examples of signage are attached in Exhibit A.

MAD/mad/LJG/ljg

Established and Adopted by Resolution No. 1683, 10/17/11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Wednesday at 7:00 pm with 6:00 pm work session</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Committee</td>
<td>Fage</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Wednesday at 6:00 pm VIA ZOOM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Office of</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td>Kindel</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Thursday 7:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec Board</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Monday at 6:00 pm</td>
<td>7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Coordinating</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Monday at 12:00 noon</td>
<td>7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee (WCCC)</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Wednesday at 7:00 pm</td>
<td>7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Monday at 7:00pm</td>
<td>7/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Board</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Wednesday at 4:00pm VIA ZOOM</td>
<td>7/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC)</td>
<td>Fage</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th Wednesday at 5:00pm</td>
<td>7/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col-Pac EDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Area Communications</td>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission (MACC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2021 City Council Meeting Dates-7:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>NO MTG</td>
<td>10/4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>4/19</td>
<td>7/19</td>
<td>10/18</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>8/16</td>
<td>11/15</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>8/16</td>
<td>11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>12/6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings in yellow are Tuesday meetings due to Monday holidays.

Meetings with ** behind them have a 6:00 pm Work Session.

## 2021 Schedule for Board and Commission Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Wednesday 6:00 pm</th>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>2nd Monday 6:00 pm</th>
<th>Parks &amp; Recreation Board</th>
<th>2nd Wednesday 7:00 pm</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>3rd Wednesday 7:00 pm</th>
<th>Library Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1/13</td>
<td>Fage</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>Kindel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>Fage</td>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>Kindel</td>
<td>4/21</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>MARTINEZ</td>
<td>5/19</td>
<td>Fage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>Fage</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>PAPEN</td>
<td>6/16</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>NO MEETING</td>
<td>7/12</td>
<td>Kindel</td>
<td>7/14</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>Papen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>Kindel</td>
<td>8/9</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>8/11</td>
<td>Fage</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td>9/13</td>
<td>Fage</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Kindel</td>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Fage</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3</td>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>11/8</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
<td>11/17</td>
<td>Kindel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Filename: City Council\2017 Calendar of Meetings
## 2021 Council Committee Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Area Communications Commission (MACC)</td>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tual Valley Comm Access TV (TVCTV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets 1:30-4:00pm in Beaverton. Dates set approx. 3 weeks in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC)</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet 2nd &amp; 4th Wednesday of each month 5:00-7:00pm at Metro Council Chambers in Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Coordinating Committee (WCCC)</td>
<td>Lenahan</td>
<td>Papen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet 2nd Monday of each month in Beaverton 12:00-1:30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Office of Community Development: Policy Advisory Board</td>
<td>Papen</td>
<td>Kindel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet 2nd Thurs of each month 7:00-9:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various locations throughout Washington County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col-Pac / NOEA</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets 2nd Thursday of <em>every other month</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>