

CITY OF CORVALLIS

MINUTES OF THE PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD

SEPTEMBER 9, 1999

Attendance

Jo Anne Trow, Chair
Pete Bober
John Griesmeyer
Ellen Hooven
Tom Kirch
John Kwait
Reenie Sumner
Charlie Fisher
Margaret Puckette
Betty Griffiths, City Council Liaison

Visitors

John Stewart, 444 NW 9th Street
Elaine Kahn, 3012 NW Thistle
Gary Quandt, 2775 NW 26th Street
Jim Funck, 3753 NW Boxwood Place
Will Holsberry, 2915 NW Monterey Drive
Mary Kentula, 2710 NW Garryanna
Stan Beeman, 2800 NW 29th, #22
John Foster, 1205 NW Fernwood
Don Armstrong, 2710 NW Garryanna
Jane Fleischbein, 3732 NW Wisteria Way
Denis White 3775 NW Wisteria Way
Fred Pratl, 2735 NW Arthur

Staff

Réne Moye, Parks and Recreation Director
Terry Nix, Recorder

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Agenda Item	Information Only	Held for Further Review	Recommendations
Timberhill Proposal			<p>That the proposed water detention concept move forward to City Council for further consideration (passed unanimously)</p> <p>That City Council further examine the feasibility of the proposed road, giving consideration to park access, park enhancement, possible open space availability elsewhere within the development, and legal implications related to the City's agreement with Timberhill Tennis Club (passed 6 to 2).</p>

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

- I. CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Trow called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
- II. VISITORS' PROPOSITIONS: There were no visitors' propositions.
- III. TIMBERHILL PROPOSAL

Parks and Recreation Director Moyer briefly reviewed the proposal to use the public right of way for a road and to use a portion of the park for water detention. He explained that the Board will invite public input, discuss the issue, and develop a recommendation to be forwarded to the City Council. He added that there will be additional opportunity for public input at the Council level and that the Council decision will require approval from the federal government. He noted that the Board has received copies of three e-mails received on this issue. He then introduced John Stewart.

Mr. Stewart stated that he is a consultant for the Timberhill development. Timberhill is in the process of updating its master plan for undeveloped land, he said, and he reviewed the neighborhood village concept being considered for a portion of the site. This area would emphasize pedestrian use, biking, and public transit opportunities, he said, and commercial facilities would primarily serve the immediate area. He then reviewed the location of the proposed road which, he said, is instrumental to development of the village area. He noted that Timberhill has no interest in owning the road itself, but is prepared to build it and pay fair compensation to the City.

Mr. Stewart then reviewed a proposal to develop a water detention area in the park. He briefly reviewed water detention requirements and options for addressing them. He reviewed a possible site for surface detention, noting that the area would be usable a majority of the time and would be under water for only a few hours after extreme storms.

In response to inquiries from the Board, Mr. Stewart provided the following additional information:

- The detention area as proposed would be approximately 30" deep, but the design could be altered.
- The In Harmony housing project proposed for Timberhill would provide housing for trained foster parents and children, as well as senior housing. Other planned developments would include moderately priced townhouses, a village store, and office or small commercial with housing above.
- If the proposed road is not approved, the developers will then need to make decisions about how to proceed. It is likely that the proposed mixed use development application would be withdrawn.
- There are alternatives to surface water detention, including underground piping.

Elaine Kahn said she lives in Timberhill and she expressed concern regarding increased speeds and heavy traffic flows related to the proposed road. The entrance and exit onto 29th is very near the traffic signal, she said, and would likely cause traffic backups. She then addressed the water detention proposal and expressed concern about children's safety, unsightliness, and mosquitos.

Gary Quandt said he lives in Timberhill and manages Timberhill Tennis Club. The City has granted the Tennis Club an easement, he said, and he expressed concern that approval of the proposed road may affect the Club's compliance with state building codes. Mr. Moye agreed to review the agreement.

Jim Funk said he also lives in Timberhill and has been following development issues there. He noted that this proposal is part of a larger planned development which the Board has not had the opportunity to review and he stated that it is important to consider the whole master plan when making decisions. He expressed concern about the path water would take to reach the detention pond and about traffic and safety issues related to the proposed road. He noted that there are already commercial developments within easy walking distance of this site.

Will Holsberry said he is President of Timberhill Homeowners Association, made up of about 122 residents. He said he believes the proposed road would create tremendous traffic problems. He stated that the proposed water detention site is the only open unstructured play area and he questioned whether a quality ball field could be adequately maintained at a water detention site.

Mary Kentula asked what compensation would be given to the City in exchange for the proposed road and who would be responsible for maintenance for the proposed detention site. With the Chair's permission, Mr. Stewart responded that compensation has not been determined, but could take many forms. Mr. Moye added that maintenance responsibilities would have to be worked out between the developer and the City. Ms. Kentula noted that consideration should be given to the fact that detention areas can fail and do require significant maintenance.

Stan Beeman expressed concern about the aesthetics of the entrance way which, he said, is currently very nice. He asked whether a survey was done to address traffic impacts to 29th Street. Mr. Stewart responded that a survey is on file with the City and indicates the area is capable of handling traffic at full build out. Mr. Beeman expressed concern regarding drainage and Mr. Stewart explained that the road would require a storm pipe system.

John Foster said he does not live in Timberhill but he has serious concerns about these proposals. He stated that the City should have a very good reason to give away or sell park land to anybody. He has attended many meetings regarding neighborhood centers, he said, and the point is to encourage pedestrian activity, not to build additional roads. He expressed concern about using public land for drainage, noting that there are more expensive alternatives for the developers.

Don Armstrong said he is interested in this issue because it is the first piece of a much larger plan which will impact everyone along Walnut Boulevard. He urged the Board to review the traffic study on file with the City which, he said, has been somewhat misrepresented. He asked that these issues be reviewed with consideration to traffic patterns for the entire area and he suggested that adequate compensation for the water detention area might be in the form of open space in other parts of the development.

Jane Fleischbein said she lives in Timberhill and agrees with many of the issues raised in previous testimony. An additional issue, she said, is that one purpose of parks is to provide open space for unstructured play. She noted that a ballfield would have to be fenced. She said she doesn't think it is appropriate to put a road in this location and she does not feel the City would be adequately compensated for giving away this parkland.

Denis White said he lives in Timberhill and is a member of the Planning Commission. He questioned whether the Board can sufficiently judge the merits of these proposals without conducting a more comprehensive look at the entire development. He opined that it would be appropriate for the developer to present a larger picture of the conceptual plan, including the location of additional detention facilities and the layout of the road system.

Discussion followed regarding the role of this Board. Chair Trow noted that the Board has been asked to review the concept and Mr. Moye said the Board should determine whether they believe the proposals have merit and should be considered by Council.

Fred Pratl spoke in support of maintaining green space. He expressed concern related to hydraulics and the buffer between the wetlands and the proposed developments. He asked that the larger context of the development be taken into full consideration. He questioned why the road is necessary for the shopping center if the purpose is pedestrian friendly mixed use development.

Discussion:

Mr. Kwait said his understanding of the role of this Board is to consider issues as related to the parks. It is his opinion, he said, that park land should not be given away and that development of the road would make the park more exclusive. He expressed opposition to the proposals. Mr. Bober noted that the park already has limited access and brief discussion followed.

Mr. Bober said he shares Mr. Kwait's feelings about the value of park land and he understands the neighbors desire to retain the current beauty of the area. He said it appears that development will occur regardless of whether these proposals are approved and he prefers the alternative of mixed use new urbanism to high density housing and the associated increases in traffic and congestion. He noted that the proposals will undergo review by experts in many areas and that the required processes will ensure that legitimate concerns related to design are addressed.

Mr. Kirch said he is not generally in support of giving away park land; however, if a proposal addresses a better way to serve the community, it should be explored. He noted that the park is not currently usable during the wet season and that development of a detention center may make the space more usable. He expressed concern about traffic on the proposed road it and suggested those numbers be made available.

Ms. Sumner noted that 11 people spoke out against using park land for these purposes and not one spoke in favor. She said some excellent points were made related to the commercial use of

park land and whether park land should be sold in this way. She expressed support for the In Harmony project. In response to her inquiry, Mr. Stewart said the In Harmony application is being held by the City because it includes reference to these proposals which have not yet been approved.

Ms. Puckette stated that it is possible to design the detention area in a way which allows it to remain usable and open. Approval of this proposal may provide better access and provide negotiating leverage for other open space, she added.

It was moved, seconded, and carried unanimously to recommend that the proposed water detention concept move forward to City Council for further consideration.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that City Council further examine the feasibility of the proposed road, giving consideration to issues such as park access, park enhancement, possible open space availability elsewhere within the development, and legal implications related to the City's agreement with the Timberhill Tennis Club. The motion passed by a vote of 7 to 2:

Yes: Bober, Griesmeyer, Hooven, Kirch, Fisher, Puckette, Trow
No: Kwait, Sumner

Mr. Stewart thanked the Board for their consideration. He advised that maps are available at City Hall and at the Timberhill office and he said he is willing and anxious to meet with residents on an individual or group basis.

Discussion followed regarding the actions taken this evening. Chair Trow clarified that the Board has indicated that these proposals merit further exploration and consideration of additional factors of which the Board is not privy. Mr. Kwait said it would have been helpful if the appropriate staff had been available to answer specific questions this evening

IV. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.