

## Cedar Hills Park Improvements – Public Task Force Meeting #1 Meeting Notes

**Meeting Date/Time:** 4-3-2014 / 4:00 pm to 5:30 pm

**Meeting Location:** Cedar Hills Recreation Center (11640 SW Park Way, Portland, 97225)

### Attendees:

#### ***(Public Task Force)***

Joan Hulquist – BSD/Walker ES \*

Colleen Stofan – Walker ES PTC

Virginia Bruce – CPO 1

Jen Smith – Cedar Hills HOA \*

*\*not in attendance*

Karey Welling – Local Business \*

Pam Zimmerman – Local Business \*

Frank Angelo – At-large, Planning

Greg Cody – At-large, Parks & Sports

#### ***(THPRD)***

Aisha Willits – Director of Planning

Matt Kilmartin – Planning / PM

Steve Gulgren – Superintendent of Planning

Nicole Paulsen – Planning

#### ***(MacKay Sposito, Inc.)***

Jim Sandlin – Project Manager

Andrew Holder – Landscape Design

The meeting began with introductions and then Matt Kilmartin provided an overview of the project history to date. Jim Sandlin continued with updates to the site Inventory, Analysis, Program, and the IGA (inter-governmental agreement) with Beaverton School District.

### General Discussion

- 1) Greg: what type of park is this intended to be, and what standards apply for that type of park?
  - a. It is designated as a Community Park in THPRD's Comprehensive Plan.
- 2) Greg: when planning for this park, we need to dream for the next 100 years. The population and demand will only grow, and this bond measure may be the biggest opportunity for improvements for the next 100 years.
- 3) Colleen: the neighbors on SW 121<sup>st</sup> Place should be involved as stakeholders. They are not part of the Cedar Hills HOA.
  - a. All park neighbors will have the opportunity to review the proposed improvements and provide feedback during the various public meetings planned during the master planning phase of the project and via the project web page.

### Inventory Overview

- 4) No changes to the Inventory exhibit from what was shown previously. THPRD expects to close on the property acquisition of 1.6 acres from the Beaverton School District soon, which brings the park's total size to almost 12 acres.

- 5) The Clean Water Services sanitary lines running through the site will need to be addressed. We're proposing to re-route the lines on-site so they are not under the new synthetic turf field.

### Program Overview

- 6) The currently proposed program will fill all available space in the park. It will change the character of the park from being primarily passive recreation, to a park dominated by active recreation.
- 7) The double synthetic turf field can only fit in the northern portion of the park. In that location it will likely still encroach on the school's property, and will likely impact the heritage oak trees and much of the fir grove.
- 8) Colleen predicts a huge public backlash against removing the heritage oaks, but maybe not as much opposition to removing part of the fir grove.
- 9) Greg expressed skepticism that all of the programmed amenities can fit on the site: "something needs to go."
- 10) Why is a double size synthetic turf field proposed?
  - a. Matt: in order to accommodate both soccer and baseball, it needs to be at least a 1.5x size field. A double field would allow two simultaneous soccer or baseball games, or four baseball practices. A double field would maximize the district's ability to program multiple sports activities at the same time, and thereby helping to fulfill the current and future needs of high-demand recreational opportunities for district patrons.
  - b. Steve, Greg: the bond measure promised a lit, multi-use synthetic field, a splash pad, and community park redevelopment.
  - c. Frank: "community park redevelopment" means a certain level of improvement, and significant trees may need to be removed to fulfill the bond measure.
  - d. Colleen: also the IGA includes a new playground.
  - e. Frank, Colleen: was a double size field specifically stated in the bond?
  - f. Matt: Yes, THPRD management believes the bond promised two fields at Cedar Hills Park. Matt will check on the specific language of the bond. [Update: materials were provided to the task force members for review following this meeting, which reflected 1) THPRD's typical community park amenities, and 2) bond measure language presented to voters. Bond language reflects multi-field/multi-purpose synthetic athletic field and youth athletic field development throughout the District, and that Cedar Hills Park was to receive multi-field/multi-purpose athletic field development with lights (among other amenities).]
- 11) Virginia: could the playground go in the fir grove? The grove is shady and cool, and could provide opportunities for nature play experiences.
  - a. Matt: typically THPRD avoids putting playgrounds under large trees due maintenance issues and hazards such as falling branches, but it's not out of the question.
- 12) Virginia: the tennis courts could be removed from the program, and you can light the courts at Cedar Park Middle School instead to satisfy that demand.

- 13) Virginia: The community gardens could also be moved to another site.
- 14) Frank and Colleen expressed surprise at the vehicular connection proposed through the site, which would connect the school to Cedar Hills Blvd.
  - a. Jim: this access is part of the park district's IGA with the school district, and is intended to ease congestion at the intersection of Walker Rd. and Lynnfield, provide access to the school from Cedar Hills Blvd. for buses and parents to drop-off and pick-up, and allow the school and park to share parking.
  - b. Colleen: the driveway could be a safety hazard, and safety measures and access control would need to be implemented.
  - c. Matt: as a condition of our IGA with the school district, safe pedestrian access between the school and sports field (at the park) will be required during school hours. This will be addressed in the design development of the park.
- 15) Virginia: park users often park in the PetSmart parking lot, and PetSmart customers often walk their dog in the fir grove. PetSmart should be engaged in order to develop an agreement for this shared use.
  - a. Matt: THPRD has contacted PetSmart and has attempted numerous times to contact the land owner of that lot, but they have not responded. A representative from PetSmart is assigned to this public task force, and I am keeping them informed as we proceed. This will likely need to be resolved by installing a fence along the property line between PetSmart and the park.

### **March 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting with Washington County Transportation**

- 1) Full half-street improvements (for ultimate 5 lanes build-out) along the Walker Rd frontage may be required.
- 2) No vehicle access from Walker Rd. will be allowed at this time, and the westerly PetSmart driveway may be removed once Walker Rd is widened. If there were access from Walker Rd in the future, it would need to be a signalized intersection aligned with 123<sup>rd</sup> Ave (south of Walker Rd).
  - a. Frank and Colleen like the idea of a new intersection to access the park from Walker Rd.
- 3) The new driveway through the site, bus traffic entering from Cedar Hills Blvd, and left turns into the site from Cedar Hills Blvd would likely trigger a requirement to widen Cedar Hills Blvd. Based on the traffic study prepared by the consultant's traffic engineer, a signalized intersection isn't warranted at Cedar Hills Blvd and Huntington.
  - a. If there is a left turn lane into the park, a left turn lane onto Huntington would also be required. This would mean a much longer length of road would need to be widened along the park's frontage.
  - b. Colleen: right-in and right-out only (which would not require signalization and road widening) won't provide enough access to the park.
- 4) Instead of the proposed driveway through the site, we've researched the possibility of sharing an entry driveway with the racquet club (adjacent property to the north).

- a. There is an old, partially vacated right-of-way which follows the property line between the park and racquet club; the property line is the center line of the right-of-way.
  - b. The existing racquet club entrance would need to be abandoned because the two driveways would be too close. A new entrance to the racquet club parking lot would then need to be provided off the new driveway from the park.
  - c. This route would connect Cedar Hills Blvd. to Lynnfield, but an internal drive would still be needed between the school and sports field to on-site parking (at the park) so this wouldn't solve the safety issue for pedestrian access between the school and sports field. Also, it is likely the new drive connection to the racquet club would impact their existing parking counts, which would need to be mitigated by adding additional parking elsewhere.
- 5) Unknown: maybe there should be a new transit stop for the park on Walker Rd.
- 6) Colleen: there is already a significant need for a left turn lane from Walker Rd. onto Lynnfield Ln, even if there will also be access through the park from Cedar Hills Blvd.

#### **Next steps**

- Staff will present the input received from the task force to THPRD management.
- Options to resolve the traffic issues need to be explored further.
- MacKay Sposito will develop concept studies based on public input received so far and direction from THPRD.
- The next Public Task Force meeting is tentatively scheduled for early June.
- Matt: do we have consensus to move forward?: “This will be a community park for active recreational use, but will not be developed to the level of a sports complex. The terms of the bond measure and the IGA with Beaverton School District need to be fulfilled, and further community park amenities will be provided as space and public interest dictate.” The group voiced agreement and no objections were raised to this statement.

**Meeting Adjourned at 5:30pm**