

Public comment report

Public comments on city expansion proposals for the 2018 growth management decision

August 2018

APPENDIX D: COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE COMMENT PERIOD

From: Johns, Jason [<mailto:jason.johns@stoel.com>]

Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2018 3:28 PM

To: 2040 <2040@oregonmetro.gov>

Subject: UGB Expansion

I'm writing to specifically comment on the proposal as it affects Cooper Mountain in Beaverton. I respectfully ask that you accept these comments out of time.

The proposal to expand the UGB to include the Cooper Mountain Reserve will negatively impact an area of Washington County that remains a rural gem. Cooper Mountain's charm is in that it is NOT like Tigard's Bull Mountain, i.e., a seemingly endless and faceless suburban sprawl that should serve as an example to avoid. Cooper Mountain is, instead, open and airy, with parcel sizes averaging over an acre in size. Many are larger. It's a place to escape the city. A place to breathe.

I live near the top of Cooper Mountain, and on my property alone I regularly witness deer, coyotes, bobcats, red tail hawks, turkey vultures, and great horned owls that travel through and make this area their home. The expansion of the UGB to include the upper portions of Cooper Mountain, and the subsequent development (and massive changes to infrastructure) that will inevitably follow, will drive these species out of the area or, possibly worse, increase their human interactions (which are rarely positive). In considering an expansion to the UGB, Metro should not only consider the issue of affordable housing; it should also consider the issue of how to conserve natural, open spaces-- something that I once understood was a priority to Oregonians and, specifically, those around Portland metro. But the dense infill that I've seen occurring around South Cooper Mountain (and the possibility that it may spread across the entire mountain) makes me doubt whether that commitment continues.

The disappearance of open space and Cooper Mountain's natural charm and habitat is too high of a price to pay for condos, apartments, and dense suburban housing. There are other less-critical areas of Washington County where the infrastructure and the environment can better tolerate such growth and expanded infrastructure, such as the areas around Mountainside HS and the base of South Cooper Mountain. I urge you to leave the areas above the base of Cooper Mountain outside of the UGB. It is a special place. Protect it.

Sincerely,

Jason Johns

From: "Ron Johnson" <ron0448@yahoo.com>

Date: July 14, 2018 at 11:40:36 AM PDT

To: <tom.hughes@oregonmetro.gov>

Subject: Urban Growth Boundary

July 13, 2018

Dear Mr. Hughes,

I am writing this letter as a concerned resident and landowner in the area known as URA-6D. Although I recognize that some change is inevitable, managing growth and development in areas considered for urban growth expansion should never adversely affect existing residents. I want to go on record as strongly opposing the Master Plan submitted for URA-6D by King City, and I urge you to dismiss their proposal from consideration as you weigh the options for urban growth expansion for the reasons I have listed below.

First, this isn't just a chunk of land. This is a home to many residents and a place we have CHOSEN to live because of its unique character. There are areas of farmland, tracts of acreage with established homes, wetlands, forested areas, and ravines that are home to a wide variety of wildlife, an existing airfield, a designated natural reserve, and a long-established subdivision of homes, Rivermeade, that is a thriving community in itself. People take pride in their property and together care for all the land in the community. King City's proposal would not only surround this enclave with a bustling urban environment, but their proposal to extend Fischer Road would quite literally cut the neighborhood in half.

King City's plan is premature. The development of River Terrace on the west slopes of Bull Mountain is in full swing, as is the development on South Cooper Mountain. Already we have seen a huge increase of traffic on Roy Rogers Road, Fischer Road, Pacific Highway, and Beef Bend Road. The effects of a new, large development added to the existing traffic flows are yet unknown. While King City's plan is for expansion of both Roy Rogers and Beef Bend to five lanes, it really does nothing to address the bottlenecks that already exist where Beef Bend intersects with Roy Rogers and with Pacific Highway. Furthermore, extending Fischer Road through the area to alleviate traffic flows will do nothing but create a new set of bottlenecks as motorists discover a new "shortcut". Tri-Met has not indicated any interest in providing transit service to the area, and if the proposed light rail line through Tigard is approved, any residents desiring to use that service would have to drive through this area to do so. Allowing for additional development without first having a comprehensive plan for traffic flow through the area is pure folly and a recipe for disaster. Any development of this area should be postponed until transportation issues have been fully planned and funded.

King City has not been very forthcoming to either its existing residents nor to residents in the affected area. The city leaders keep pointing out the urgency of their need to expand because there is no more developable land in the existing city limits. Residents have not been queried regarding their opinions or concerns other than a few open house meetings and have had to rely on seeing their Master Plan as it unfolded and evolved. It was interesting to see that the estimated overall cost more than doubled in a single month earlier this year. When asked whether residents would incur any additional costs for this plan, they were assured that no one would pay a penny in additional property taxes, which is an outright lie. Additional development in surrounding areas means an increase in assessed value, which equates to additional property taxes. In their plan, they are also envisioning a complete new Town Center near the

intersection of Beef Bend and Roy Rogers, but there is no money budgeted in the Plan for that. It would certainly require a bond measure that, if passed, would mean additional taxes.

In a recent article published by Pamplin Media Group, a comparison was made of the various proposals being presented for your consideration. It is interesting to note that Beaverton's proposal would accommodate around 3760 new homes on 1232 acres on Cooper Mountain. King City proposes roughly the same number of homes (3300) but on only 528 acres. It's of further interest that perhaps only half of that (King City) acreage is actually suited for development due to terrain and other environmental constraints (wetlands, flood plain, etc.). So, King City's proposal might be best described as a "let's see how many houses we can cram together in one area in order to increase our tax revenue" approach. If I were to envision that sort of density on my simple acre of land, it would mean I would have twelve houses on the same footprint where my one house currently sits. That's not an environment I would care to live in. Would you?

King City has repeatedly told us that no resident in the current URA would be FORCED to annex into the city. Frankly, most of us would choose not to. Therefore, approval of their plan would result in an 'old' King City along Pacific Highway, a 'new' King City along Roy Rogers Road, and a bunch of patchwork plots for several miles in the middle, with some incorporated parcels and some unincorporated. With King City's focused attention on the new development, this will likely lead to the deterioration of the existing King City property. It would also create inefficiencies in maintenance, emergency services, and other services that existing residents are dependent upon.

One of the things you, as a Metro Councilor, must consider is the availability of affordable housing within the Metro area. Under King City's plan, the cost of development of parcels is going to make the price of new housing units unaffordable to many new residents. With current housing prices in the Metro area already accelerating to record levels, it does little to address any housing crisis we may have. Coupled with a lack of industrial development that would pay family-wage salaries, it makes any realistic development impossible. King City's plan for ground-floor boutique shops with upstairs apartments is nothing more than a Pollyanna solution. It's just not realistic.

As I said, I know that at some point development of this area will be inevitable. I don't have my head in the sand. However, that doesn't mean that King City's plan is a good plan. I spent a long career as a project manager and analyst. One of the most basic (and often overlooked) principles is that, when proposing solutions to a perceived problem, one solution must always be considered – DO NOTHING. It's often the best solution. That is the case with URA-6D. Rejecting King City's proposal does not mean there is no other plan. If King City's plan is rejected, it may well be that eventually Tigard or even Sherwood may present a plan that is more sensible. Right now, King City's plan seems more like a land grab than anything else.

If you are unfamiliar with the area, I encourage you to come visit us. I'll be happy to show you around. As I said, it's not just a chunk of land or some markings on a map. I urge you to consider your options carefully. I doubt there are many people in the Metro area who would be content to see us create a version of Orange County North.

Respectfully,
Ron Johnson

13880 SW River Lane, Tigard, OR 97224, 503-914-9467, ron0448@yahoo.com

From: Hella Betts [mailto:hella@cascadewestern.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2018 2:50 PM
To: Frankie Lewington
Subject: RE: UGB growth

Thank you for your reply.

Hella

From: Frankie Lewington [mailto:Frankie.Lewington@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2018 2:22 PM
To: Hella Betts
Subject: RE: UGB growth

Good afternoon Ms. Betts,

Thank you for your comments. I have forwarded them over to Council President Hughes' office.

The comment period for the city expansion proposals closed earlier this month. This fall, the Metro Council will consider whether or not to expand the urban growth boundary based on the submitted city expansion proposals and public comments on those city expansion proposals. The Metro Council will also hold public hearings (on September 20 and 27) and provide direction to staff on whether or where the UGB will be expanded.

You can learn more about the growth management process [here](#).

If you have any other questions, please don't hesitate to reach out.

Best,

Frankie

Frankie Lewington
Land and transportation communications

Metro | oregonmetro.gov
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-813-7588

From: Betts [mailto:hella@cascadewestern.com] **On Behalf Of** Metro
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2018 12:02 PM
To: feedback <feedback@oregonmetro.gov>
Subject: UGB growth

New feedback form submission: submitted on Thursday, July 19, 2018 - 12:01pm

First name: Hella

Last name: Betts

hella@cascadewestern.com

Subject: UGB growth

Comment or question:

I am a resident who lives in Sherwood and commutes through King City everyday to Portland, I respectfully fine Council President Tom Hughes opinion very 20th century. Metro should "build for 25 years ahead not wait 25 years to build". Traffic already is stand still from 3pm to 6pm daily. I am very disappointed that Sherwood is not considered in the UGB. I believe everyone in METRo is part of the "SWAMP" we need fresh eyes.

From: McVicker [<mailto:9mcvic@comcast.net>] **On Behalf Of** Metro

Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 4:19 PM

To: feedback <feedback@oregonmetro.gov>

Subject: King City boundary expansion

New feedback form submission: submitted on Friday, August 3, 2018 - 4:18pm

###

First name: Brian

Last name: McVicker

9mcvic@comcast.net

Subject: King City boundary expansion

Comment or question:

I live on the south side of Bull Mtn. There are 4 high schools closer to us than the one we are assigned to(Tualatin HS). It takes almost an hour to drive to Tualatin HS and back home. The new King City expanded boundaries will be in the same situation. There seems to be little if any consideration to school impact. School district boundaries need to be addressed. The current build out on the west side of Bull Mtn. makes no sense in regard to school boundaries, you can see schools from your house but drive an hour to the one you are assigned. I am not against expansion, I am against building with no consideration to the future. Respectfully, Brian McVicker



City of King City

15300 S.W. 116th Avenue, King City, Oregon 97224-2693
Phone: (503) 639-4082 • FAX: (503) 639-3771
www.ci.king-city.or.us

August 3, 2018

Dear Metro Council President Tom Hughes and Fellow Metro Councilors:

The Portland region is in the midst of a housing affordability crisis and King City is ready to be part of the solution. King City is eager to play a leading regional role in addressing housing affordability, variety and equity.

On behalf of the citizens of King City and a unanimous city council, I urge the Metro Council to approve our proposal to include 528 acres immediately west of current city limits inside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) which will allow 318 acres for new housing and 210 acres for public spaces and natural areas.

The King City proposal, along with proposals from Hillsboro, Beaverton and Wilsonville, will create the opportunity for 9,200 more housing units in the metro area, helping to alleviate pressures on housing prices, increase housing choices and manage the population growth expected over the next 20 years. The King City proposal, alone, will allow approximately 3500 new housing units. Even with these additions, as Metro's own staff has identified, more will need to be done to address the supply of housing in the Portland-area over the next 20 years.

Because of our unique history as a community, when some people from outside of King City think about our community, they very likely envision a retirement community around a public golf course. This is an outdated and incomplete picture of the King City of today – and of the future.

King City is an affordability-sensitive community -- 50% of our households earn less than \$50,000 a year. King City is compact and pedestrian-friendly with diverse housing options for all income levels – single family, apartments, condominiums and modular homes. King City is a rapidly diversifying community – from 2000 to 2010 our racial diversity went from 1.69 percent to 11 percent. King City is a community where working families and those on fixed incomes can still afford to own a home – last summer the average home sale price was \$352,000, an amount significantly less than nearby communities. And King City is an inclusive community – with a city council reflecting a beautiful mosaic of backgrounds -- racial, ethnic, age and sexual orientation.

Over the next 20 years, King City is expected to grow by 46 percent, but today we're out of land. For King City to remain affordable and welcoming to all, we need additional land to carefully manage our growth and provide the diverse housing choices and prices that will allow us to remain an accessible and vibrant city. Importantly, the new neighborhoods in our proposal will be designed with streets, sidewalks, trails, parks and natural areas that will enhance the livability and quality of life for both existing and new residents.

As a small city with tax-sensitive residents, King City has designed a plan to ensure that the new development contained in our proposal will pay for itself and protects current taxpayers. New infrastructure like roads, sidewalks and utilities will be paid by fees on private developers, not increased

utility fees or new taxes on current residents. King City residents will retain the same permanent tax rate they have today.

King City is proud of the proposal we've submitted to Metro for consideration. It reflects a strong commitment within our tight-knit community to extensive public participation and involvement. Over the past two years, we've create advisory committees and held public meetings, in addition to our council hearings, to engage our residents in a discussion about our future.

Given the severity of the housing affordability crisis in the region, we urge the Metro Council to do everything within their power to increase the supply of new housing opportunities to help drive down costs. King City is eager to play our role – along with other communities – in being a part of the solution to our regional housing affordability crisis.

We thank you for your continued leadership and welcome any of your thoughts or questions about our proposal. We also invite you – anytime – to come and visit King City and see first-hand the benefits and promise of our community.

Kind Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'KG', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Mayor Kenneth Gibson
King City, OR

CC:

Martha Bennett, Metro COO