

**Jason T**

---

**Subject:** FW: Vose Elementary Rebuild: 1/27/16 Planning Commission - Initial Comments

**From:** Carmela M Bowns [mailto:[cmbowns@gmail.com](mailto:cmbowns@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 06, 2016 12:48 PM

**To:** Jason T <[jasont@beavertonoregon.gov](mailto:jasont@beavertonoregon.gov)>

**Cc:** Dave Strayer <[pto@dadstrats.com](mailto:pto@dadstrats.com)>

**Subject:** Fwd: Send to Jason

Hi Jason,

Attached are comments addressing Beaverton School District's proposal and application related to rebuilding Vose Elementary School, and for the January 27, 2016, Planning Commission hearing on this proposal. If these comments need to be submitted in person or by mail instead of electronically, please let me know.

If you have questions or need additional information, please let me know.

Thanks,

Carmela M. Bowns  
11855 SW Belmont Terrace  
Beaverton, OR 97008  
[cmbowns@gmail.com](mailto:cmbowns@gmail.com)  
503/422-5688

BSD Narrative: Vose School Rebuild  
Comments for Planning Commission Hearing on 1/27/2016

I. CONDITIONAL USE AND DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATIONS

p.4: D. Transition to September 2017:

Mixes up meeting at Vose NAC (10/15/15) with meeting at Vose Elementary (10/22/15):  
Summary is from 10/22/15 meeting but should be from 10/15/15 NAC meeting.

II. CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY OF BEAVERTON DEVELOPMENT CODE  
(BDC)

Chapter 40: Applications and Approval Criteria

40.03 FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. All Conditional Use, . . . Land Division applications:

pgs. 8-9: A. **Critical facilities and services ... have adequate capacity . . .**

- Transportation: “Provide two lanes on the south leg” of Denney and King intersection for at least 200 feet for vehicle stacking on the site. Will doing this plug up/overlap with cars trying to exit via the right-turn only exit onto Denney?

The proposal doesn't appear to allow sufficient space for drop-offs and pick-ups without spilling over and stacking on Denney.

How many vehicles does the proposal provide for in the am? How many in the pm?

pgs. 11-12: G. **On-site vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems connect . . . in a safe, efficient, and direct manner.**

- How easy will it be for busses and vehicles leaving the western parking lot to turn left onto Denney? Won't vehicles trying to turn left from the western lot be mixing it up with east-bound Denney traffic and not able to get out, as there will not be a signal there?
- The design for drop-off and pick-up doesn't seem functional in actual practice. There doesn't appear to be adequate space for the number of cars dropping-off and picking-up students, or to do so safely. Additionally, those cars are shown in single file. The explanation that cars will use the circulating lane to leave and refill spots (p.32, TIA) might sound possible, but in reality, how will that work?

As cars in various locations pull out, into the circulating lane, how are those spots going to be filled? Is the expectation that new cars will come in and parallel park in an empty spot? Or is the expectation that each time there one car leaves, all other cars will move

forward one spot? How many times is that expected to happen in a line of 12 – 22 cars? Is this functional? Safe? How can a car parallel park if other cars are in the circulating lane? Is it wise design to force cars to move up one spot at a time, multiple times, when loading/unloading elementary school students? Is there data to support the statements that using the circulation lane is safe and functional?

How are students going to be able to identify their vehicle? If cars are queued up 22 long, some of those cars will be around the curve and up the far side. Do students run around to their car? Even the youngest ones? Or are they expected to cut across the planter strip in the middle of the east lot? What about conflicts between pedestrians and cars exiting the pick-up area if students cut across the planted strip?

Mitigating this by requiring staff to take each student to his/her car is not effective, safe, or appropriate mitigation. The initial design solution should not rely on individualized, manual intervention by a substantial number of school staff to resolve this matter. Any extra intervention should be a default, not the prime method of addressing a problem issue. And how long will this take to get students – one by one-- to the correct car?

- Of the 44 vehicles that BSD says can queue up, BSD says at least 10 of those are vehicles are *leaving* the grounds, waiting to go straight, or turn left or right onto Denney. Those shouldn't be included in the queue count as cars that are not being stacked on Denney. That substantially reduces the number of cars able to queue on-site.

Also, some of those queued cars are waiting to exit left, right, or straight, at the main entrance and probably, with a line of 10 cars, are blocking/overlapping other cars waiting to turn right (east) onto Denney. That exacerbates the internal backup.

BSD acknowledges (p. 25 TIA) that the am car queue backs up to Anne Avenue. How does the current proposal alleviate that?

- BSD says “most queuing” . . . “will be accommodated on-site, thus minimizing stacking” on Denney Road. However, as now designed, that seems highly unlikely.

What is the number of cars this plan provides for, for drop off? What is the number of cars provided for, for pick-up? Do these numbers match the proposal?

- Note that the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is based more on behavioral expectations, voluntary compliance, and substantial staff resources than on data-driven mitigation measures. It contains objectives but no assurances of success, even if the TMP is fully implemented. It is based on hope, not data. (p.1 Background; p.3 Provide convenient and efficient traffic circulation)

The TMP does not explain how a queue of 22 cars functions individually or as a unit to provide efficient and safe student drop-off. (p.2 Private Vehicles) The TMP does not address after-school pick-up at all in the Private Vehicles sections on pages 2 or 3. There

are numerous issues with the after-school pick-up process that need to be addressed to meet the efficiency and safety criteria.

Given the long-term importance of the traffic plan for drop-off and pick-up, it seems critical to have a virtual demonstration – simulating cars going through the process – before this component of the proposal is approved.

p. 12: J. **Grading ... to accommodate and mitigate drainage issues:**

Narrative says grading “will not *increase* drainage to existing properties, . . . However, at the NAC meeting (10/15/15), more than one property owner complained of on-going drainage and run-off issues impacting property on Clifford Street, and of those issues not having been resolved through the years.

Just “not increasing” those problems is not sufficient for this project. The issues should be addressed and corrected.

40.15 CONDITIONAL USE

40.15.15. Application

3. New Conditional Use.

C. Approval Criteria. Make findings showing criteria are satisfied.

pgs 14-15 4. **Site can reasonably accommodate the proposal.**

Comments under 40.03, above, indicate several questions about compliance with this criteria without further design and mitigation effort.

CHAPTER 60 – SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

60.05 DESIGN REVIEW DESIGN PRINCIPLES, STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

pgs. 17-19 **60.5.35 Building Design and Orientation Guidelines**

1. Building articulation and variety
2. Roof forms
3. Primary building entrances
4. Exterior building materials
5. Screening of equipment

BSD submitted design revisions to Vose’s exterior, including roof design and exterior colors, on December 22, 2015. BSD’s comment accompanying the revision is below.

The general Vose community is not aware of these changes and has not reviewed them, making it difficult to comment on them now. Some may consider these changes substantial and significant.

While we would like to reserve the ability to present comments and ask questions until we have the chance to review them, one initial comment is that the narrative suggests a bland, no-color façade. Is that correct? What color(s) will the facility be? Can there be a more realistic presentation of what the revisions look like, from a pedestrian view?

Will the information related to 60.5.35 Building Design and Orientation Guidelines in the Narrative (pgs. 17-19) be revised to reflect and be consistent with these changes?

<p>The changes in the elevations consist of going with a simply pitched roof at the main facades rather than a gabled expression. This simpler expression was desired to make a more modern gesture and avoid any potential issues of following trends in design. The façade remains an articulated box with varying materials and an experiential approach towards color. The updated design strives to create a more sophisticated and subtle note towards elementary school design while maintaining the playful nature the team desires for the school. The elevations when viewed abstractly in elevational view are almost devoid of color, but when you experience the building you will find color expressed in surprising ways. The design team has create a façade where color is occurring on the sides of the vertical solid panels on the upper façade, with those colors also reflected in the lower level windows and overtly expressed in the courtyard design. The intent was to create an experience that is both playful and civic while avoiding trends to create a timeless architecture.</p>	
--	--

#### **60.5.40 Circulation and Parking Design Guidelines**

p.20 1. Vehicle circulation system . . . provides for efficient access and circulation.

See earlier comments under 40.03, above, raising questions about the efficiency and safety of access and circulation, and the ability of the site to handle traffic and stacking on-site.

#### **60.5.45 Landscape , Open Space. . . Design Guidelines**

- p.21 3.D. **Existing mature trees** . . . should be retained and incorporated into the landscaping.

p.23 10. **Natural areas**

There is some community concern that the two majestic sequoias will be lost. If they are removed, there is additional interest in finding the “time capsule” that is believed to be located near one of them.

- p.21 **60.5.45 Soccer Field Surface**

Recognizing that Vose is a community with a high and active interest in soccer, that the general community uses the field areas at Vose for organized and pick-up soccer practices and games, and that there are no other soccer fields close to Vose school, we urge that the U-12 soccer field be turf rather than grass.

Following are some of the reasons for creating the U-12 soccer field as turf rather than grass:

- Field subject to substantial use for soccer
- Ability to use field year-round compared to many months of not being able to use a grass field
- Grass fields get ruined early in the season and stay unplayable after that
- Creating acceptable drainage for a grass soccer field, given Vose's conditions, would be very expensive
- Turf minimizes maintenance
- Turf field is able to tolerate much more/intense use than grass field
- More people/age groups get use from a turf field compared to grass b/c availability is maximized
- BSD has installed or converted many grass fields to turf
- U-12 soccer field is an extraordinarily valuable asset to the Vose community, and maximizing use is a significant contribution to the neighborhood
- Turf field encourages healthy activity (due to availability year-round), and is an important social determinant of health in this community
- Since overall field area is reduced with rebuilt school, investing in maximum use U-12 turf field is a reasonable trade-off for the reduced activity area.

## 60.30 OFF-STREET PARKING

### p.27-28 **60.30.10 Parking Spaces**

Although bike spaces are not required to be covered, in the interest of minimizing vehicular traffic and encouraging riding to school, and recognizing the short and long-term health and exercise benefits of riding bikes, could all the bike spaces be covered? This would keep bikes in better condition overall (an expensive asset to preserve), makes it much more inviting to ride when you can get on a dry bike.

## TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

### p. 31 **60.55.15 Traffic Management Plan**

Note that the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is based more on behavioral expectations, voluntary compliance, and substantial staff resources than on data-driven mitigation measures. It contains objectives but no assurances of success, even if the TMP is fully implemented. It is based on hope, not data. (p.1 Background; p.3 Provide convenient and efficient traffic circulation)

The TMP does not explain how a queue of 22 cars functions individually or as a unit to provide efficient and safe student drop-off. (p.2 Private Vehicles)

The TMP does not address after-school pick-up at all in the Private Vehicles sections on pages 2 or 3. There are numerous issues with the after-school pick-up process that need to be addressed to meet the efficiency and safety criteria.

**p.33 60.55.25 Street, Bicycle, Ped Connection Requirements**

See earlier comments under 40.03 related to questions about efficient and safe circulation and access, particularly for drop-off and pick-up issues.

**p. 37 60.55.35 Access Standards**

1. Safe access

See comments under 40.03 above for concerns about this, including stacking and queuing on Denney (and perhaps from the light at King) and internally, on-site.

III. CONFORMANCE WITH CITY OF BEAVERTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

**p. 43: 5.4.1.b On-site detention . . . to mitigate run-off**

See comments under 40.03. 1. G above about long-standing concern with run-off onto properties on Clifford Street. BSD's comments regarding flows in the southern basin do not provide property owners any assurance that the situation has been corrected, and will not get worse. Is there data to support BSD's position?

**p. 47: 6.2.4.h Consider impacts of transportation facilities**

The same concerns stated above under 40.03 A and G apply here.

###

Carmela M. Bowns  
Vose Community Member

David Strayer  
Vose Elementary PTO Past President; current parent

January 6, 2016