

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 2016
6:00 P.M.**

**Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop East
Wilsonville, Oregon**

*Minutes approved as
presented
January 18, 2017*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Al Levit, Phyllis Millan, and Simon Springall; Peter Hurley, Kamran Mesbah, and City Councilor and Charlotte Lehan were absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Miranda Bateschell, and Stephan Lashbrook

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN'S INPUT - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda.

There was none.

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, reported on behalf of Councilor Lehan, updating the Commission on two significant action items that took place at Monday's City Council meeting.

- In the work session, Council decided upon the City's new logo, which would be implemented in the New Year and branded appropriately. Council had undertaken another process, lasting about 14 months, to refine the logo. A number of artists presented at least 15 different choices and Council made revisions to the logo they preferred.
 - The selected City logo was a modern interpretation of the Hand-in-Hand with Nature theme of the current logo with a hand and seedling. The new logo was very scalable and had bright and vibrant colors with blues representing the river and the rain, green representing the trees and the land, and elements to reflect Wilsonville being a growing city. The artist had also told a story about that modern interpretation. He distributed a picture of the new logo.
- The second major action was the decision to connect the Brown Road Extension at 5th St because of better long-term suitability and stacking. Many of the engineering reasons behind the decision were based on the technical analysis.
 - A lot of testimony was provided on both sides of the issue. The neighborhood was not pleased and had significant concerns about the decision. It was a unanimous vote. Mayor Knapp stepped down from the dais and testified as a citizen, so the four remaining Councilors dealt with the final action. This was a fairly significant milestone decision considering the extension has been in the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) since 1991, the choices being either 5th St or Bailey St.
 - Chris confirmed the discussion included redoing the plan at 5th St and Boones Ferry Rd, noting a number of additional elements were added to the decision. As the design progresses and surveying occurs, there would be numerous outreach opportunities and stakeholder involvement touchpoints with the neighborhood regarding the mitigation measures at 30 percent, 70 percent and he believed at 90 percent design. There would be a lot of communication and collaboration moving forward to make that connection as suitable as possible.

Commissioner Springall said the Planning Commission had a few reservations about the 5th St Connection, which included parking and the limited right-of-way on the east side of Boones Ferry Rd due to the old buildings. Those details would still need to be worked out.

- Mr. Neamtzu replied the parking was addressed in the revisions that came before Council. The project team figured out how to maintain the parking on the 5th St segment adjacent to the existing buildings. He understood parking was not eliminated on the existing segment of 5th St.
- He noted Councilor Lehan had made specific comments about the significance and importance of the old buildings on Boones Ferry Rd. There was no intention to damage or hurt the buildings. In fact, he intended to promote something to enhance them, perhaps a façade enhancement or partnering with the property owner to do something to complement the extension project.
- He added it would be worth watching some of the Councilor's summary comments, which were incredibly thoughtful. The Councilors all articulated the rationale behind their decision-making and all had different reasons. He believed the Council made a tough decision, but had provided a lot of logic behind the decision that was made.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

A. Consideration of the November 9, 2016 Planning Commission minutes

Chair Greenfield corrected the last line of the seventh bullet on Page 3 to state, "...residential area was ~~unlikely~~ *likely* to occur since no I-5 onramp access existed."

The November 9, 2016 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as amended.

II. WORK SESSIONS

A. Town Center Plan Public Involvement (Bateschell)

Miranda Bateschell, Long-Range Planning Manager, briefly reviewed the context and background for the Town Center Plan project. The Town Center Plan was a goal set forth in both the Urban Renewal and Tourism Development Strategies, and it became one of City Council's goals in 2014. The City was awarded a \$320,000 grant from Metro at the end of 2015 for this project and established an intergovernmental grant (IGA) with Metro over the last year. The Town Center Plan contract was considered by City Council and awarded to MIG, Inc. in August 2016. The scope of work was refined and adopted in September.

- Since then, the project team has reviewed a lot of the history of Town Center and the City, in general. They toured the Town Center and adjacent areas and walked some of its segments to get a good feel of Town Center and learn what was working, where there might be challenges, and what was more easily accessible by car versus by foot.
- The project team was also gathering a lot of data to better understand the current infrastructure systems, traffic, Zoning Code, etc. to have a basis for the existing conditions work to follow and starting point for upcoming discussions with the public, Planning Commission and City Council.
- Much of the team's work thus far involved setting up the structure for the public engagement, which included creating the website and public involvement tools for the project, as well as developing the draft Public Engagement Plan. The Plan would act as a guide, laying out major events, as well as the different channels and times for the City's various communication methods.
- The intent of the Town Center Plan was to provide a community-driven vision for the Town Center and to establish clear actions toward achieving that vision. Therefore, the project team really tried to create a public engagement plan that was driven by the community.
- She briefly highlighted the extensive experience and professional background of MIG Consultant and Project Manager Alex Dupey, noting the City was excited to have his team and their experiences on this project.

Alex Dupey, Director of Planning Services, Consultant Project Manager, MIG, Inc, noted the draft Public Engagement and Communications Plan included in the meeting packet and developed with the City, was a

living document. Throughout the coming 18 months, the project team would be checking in with the Planning Commission, City Council, and the public at every stage of the process to evaluate what was and was not working and to consider the best and most effective ways to engage Wilsonville residents and businesses.

- MIG and City Staff worked together to create the logo for the project, which showed an active Town Center, the goal of the project, and a place for Wilsonville residents and businesses to come together and have a great space. The logo would become the brand for the project and be on all of the materials. Business cards with the logo, website, and a QR code were created for the project and the Commissioners were encouraged to hand them out as they talked with people about the project. The website would be continually updated throughout the project so everyone could access the current library of documents, list of next events, get updated about the current progress, and could learn how to provide input at a variety of scales. Though still pretty basic, the website was active now and would grow considerably as the project moved forward.

Mr. Dupey presented the Wilsonville Public Engagement Plan and Project Update via PowerPoint, outlining the goals and outcomes of the outreach process, as well as the methods and tools that might be utilized to gather input from Wilsonville citizens, businesses, and stakeholders about the redevelopment of Town Center.

Discussion and feedback from the Commission and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- It was important that meeting attendees receive feedback about how their comments and feedback were or were not being incorporated into the project. How would people know their input or feedback was valuable? Some of the negative feedback related to public engagement stemmed from participants not knowing what became of their comments. There was some sense that people were not heard at some of the meetings.
 - Mr. Dupey responded that every comment, whether written, on a survey, or used in a wall graphic, would all be logged as public input and become part of the record for the project, and each logged result, whether from a public meeting or part of a process would have a response. Not every comment would be put into an alternative, but the response would identify what was done. The team would also want to learn what did or did not resonate with the Planning Commission, City Council, and public, as well Staff. This one process of documentation would facilitate understanding about where things were going while also providing the Commission information so decisions could be made about what was bubbling up as a key issue or theme as the process progressed.
 - For those attending meetings or more engaged in the process, meeting summaries, including visuals and materials, would be sent to every committee member after each meeting and to anyone who signed up for updates via mail or email regarding the process. Whenever an email address was provided, they will get information until the recipient tells them not to send anything further.
 - Information and materials would always be on the website as well.
 - He assured the project team wanted to be as transparent as possible. If something was not working, the team wanted to hear about it. If the Commissioners heard something from their constituents, the team wanted to be sure to understand it.
 - Working to avoid such negative feeling was a great thing to think about this early in the process. As a living document, course corrections could be made as needed if things were not working midway through.
- The project team was encouraged to reach out to the Chamber of Commerce CEO. The Chamber holds biweekly, and sometimes three times a month, networking meetings at various business locations. The Chamber would be happy to partner in getting businesses together, but also provide the opportunity to gather information, not just from people inside Town Center, but other businesses outside Town Center.
 - Mr. Dupey confirmed MIG had done that in the past and it was really successful. Doing a quick project presentation at a meeting provided a quick way to get input.
- Given the business licenses and property owners who were targeted for outreach in the Town Center, Staff believed there were about 350 businesses and about 50 to 60 property owners.
- Redevelopment of Town Center was dependent on the property owners' initiative. Addressing issues related to property owners not wanting to redevelop might need to be worked on in the Plan. The City wanted to do engage property owners, bring them to the table, and hopefully work with them on a shared vision based on

input from the community, as well as the property owners and businesses. Some property owners might want to develop in the short-term and some mid- to long-term. The Plan would include a set of action items related to the vision so when people were ready to come online, the development would occur in accordance with that shared vision.

- Mr. Dupey added that further in the process, Leland Consulting Group and Bob Gibbs, a national retail expert, would work on some catalytic site analyses to consider what would be needed to redevelop sites where the property owners might be more willing or interested, or even sites that make a lot of sense to consider for redevelopment, such as vacant spaces. What types of uses that were in line with the vision the project might make sense? Tools within the process would help address questions about what it might take to develop or redevelop specific locations that are to be determined through the process.
- Because the project was still in the discovery phase, the project team had just started the process and was gathering information about everything that currently existed. No one was talking about what the vision might be or what that might mean as far as retaining the existing buildings and infrastructure or tearing everything down and starting over.
 - There were a lot of great businesses and great infrastructure in Town Center, and the team did not want to negatively impact that either, but to think about how to make what was working continue to work and improve what was not working. How that evolved and the viewpoint of that process would develop throughout the process.
 - There was an opportunity for more connectivity. The City could probably not start from scratch and build a whole new street grid might be done somewhere else, but there would probably be talk about making extra connections that would not impact existing businesses negatively or at least in the most minimal way possible. All of this was to be determined and discussed through the process.
 - Mr. Dupey added Town Center was a very active place with a lot of businesses and some great new buildings. Part of the process was to acknowledge what was already working in the area, but also consider what things truly make this the center of the community. That discussion would be part of the vision process starting in early 2017 with the public and community.
- Regarding the boundaries of the study area, the majority of the team's focus and work would be within the primary Town Center designation, which was in line with the City's Commercial PUD zoning, and included all the property inside Town Center Loop and those immediately adjacent on the opposite side of Town Center Loop.
 - The study area would also include what are called influence areas, basically the neighborhoods to the east, north and south of Town Center, as anything being done along Wilsonville Rd would impact both sides of the street. These influence areas were connected to and a part of how Town Center operates, but not part of the existing discrete zone.
- The Land Use Map with Circulation (Slide 3) was not a vision type of deliverable, but for a master plan. When would the Commission see the high-level plan as a deliverable to be discussed? Even with the constraints with the property owners, perhaps the City was not thinking big enough. Wilsonville's Town Center could be pretty major, and there should be agreement about what the vision was before getting into details like circulation.
 - Mr. Dupey clarified the Circulation and Land Use Maps would be outcomes of the vision and become implementation measures. The vision builds throughout the process, from the first public meeting in February to ask the community about the grand scheme and what Town Center should look like in 20 years. From that, a vision statement and some goals would start being developed for the project. The vision statement should be the guiding principle for the project and the City needed to talk to the community about what that vision looked like.
 - There was something great about Town Center and they needed to figure out how to take advantage of that. As alternatives and analyses progressed, the grand vision would be more fine-tuned as well as how to actually implement all the pieces in a realistic manner. That was where specific types of financing and projects would be considered, as well as the right level of land use that made sense for the City of Wilsonville.

- The first half of the project involved the visioning. The second half involved figuring out what made sense to actually implement those pieces in a specific manner so that as a city, there were phased, incremental steps that made sense to support businesses and residents to achieve the vision for Town Center that the community developed early on.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted the first public event to start the visioning process would be in February, and Task Force meetings would run parallel with that in February and March for more discussions. The high-level vision would come to the Planning Commission and City Council in April 2017 to talk about the vision and goals for the project, which would set the stage for discussing different ideas over the summer about design alternatives, land uses, scale, etc. through community workshops and other planned events, such as the idea centers. The first draft land use plan would probably be presented toward the end of 2017 for review and refinement, aiming at that as a deliverable in 2018. The goal was to solidify the high level vision in the spring and then work to see how it might unfold on the ground throughout the summer and fall of 2017.
 - Given Wilsonville's tremendous traffic problems, concerns were expressed about the impact traffic would have on planning for Town Center. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) would undoubtedly have something to say about any added traffic. Everyone needed to keep the City's traffic issues in mind throughout the entire planning process. While the vision for Town Center could be expansive, it was important to ensure it fit within the reality of what the City had to work with.
 - Mr. Dupey noted DKS Associates was on the team to evaluate traffic and, having done most of the traffic work within the city for many years, was well aware of the issues.
 - The vision elements that come through the public process to shape what Town Center would ultimately be would be looked at very closely to see not only how they affect traffic, but other infrastructure, like stormwater, sewer, water etc. as well. Discussions would consider what types of uses make sense, the traffic impacts, how they related to the community as a whole, and perhaps, a mix of land uses that could potentially reduce some trips. Big box commercial, for example, would have a huge traffic impact, while mixed-use would have a much different impact.
 - Being so close to the interchange, ODOT would certainly be part of the process.
- B. Frog Pond Area Plan (Neamtzu)

The following handout was entered into the record and distributed to the Planning Commission at the dais:

- One-page memorandum from Don Hanson, Otak, dated December 22, 2016 providing comments about the Residential Design Standards.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated Joe Dills would continue the conversation on the Frog Pond Master Plan by walking the Commission through the revised Code language and discussing some new Comprehensive Plan language as well as a new topic on gateways and monumentation. The project team has been working hard on the Code and collaboration with the City's development partners continued as the partners reviewed and provided feedback on the Code versions. He noted a handout had been distributed from Otak, representing West Hills Development.

- He announced that just this week, the school district determined that its 10-acre property fronting on Boeckman Rd in the Frog Pond West Neighborhood would be the site of a future primary school, which changed everything for the land plan, density calculations, and the revenue assumptions made to this point regarding the Infrastructure Financing Plan. Though frustrated by this decision coming at this point, he believed the primary school would add a tremendous asset to the West Neighborhood and result in a tremendously cohesive community.
 - Given the school district's decision, he and Mr. Dills would need to relook at the entire project as a lot of rework and remapping needed to be done. For example, the transportation network, which assumed housing on all 25 acres of the school district property, would have to be redone. There would need to be collaboration with the school district to ensure any adjustments to the transportation network were

acceptable and suited the district to accommodate a future school site, all of which would take time and resources.

- The previous schedule of Commission and Council work sessions and public hearings would have to be re-calendared over the next several months. He had targeted a public hearing in February, but it would need to be moved to March to allow time to collaborate with the school district done and also get the revisions to the City Council.
- Work had already begun on the revised street grid, and there had been communication with school district Director Tim Woodley about the concepts. A series of meetings was being set up to collaborate on text and the revisions, all of which would return to the Planning Commission for more review and feedback.

Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group (APG), noted the packet started with the updated draft Residential Neighborhood Code text and asked if the Commission had any questions about those revisions before he reviewed the Residential Design Standards, which began on Page 15 of 68.

Discussion and comments regarding the draft Residential Neighborhood Code text revisions were as follows:

- Section 4.127(.01)D (Page 3 of 68) included “cohesive neighborhoods”. Was all of Frog Pond the neighborhood or the subdivisions within?
 - The entire 180 acres was considered the Frog Pond Neighborhood. Any references to cohesion or “knitting together individual developments” referred to the entire neighborhood together.
- Section 4.127(.07)4 (Page 7 of 68) Concerns were expressed about the subjective language and the need for (.07)4 if variance provisions already existed in the Code.
 - Mr. Dills explained the intended review process was Plan Development Review (PDR) and that Code section was used as part of the model for this new zone. This type of language was actually found in several places in that part of the Code, so it just mirrored that as one style that was being done. The other part was on the open spaces, the project team realized they were not going to think of everything at this stage of code-writing. Developers would have good ideas that should be considered other than what had been proposed in this 4,000 sq ft standard.
 - The burden or authority was passed onto Development Review Board (DRB) in a number of areas. Words like ‘adequate’ were not defined and had no criteria. Section 4.127(.08)A (Page 8 of 68) stated “The purpose of these standards for the Neighborhood Zone is to provide adequate light, air, open space...” How was adequate to be understood or interpreted? Did any guidelines exist for what was adequate?
 - Mr. Dills responded no, not in this section. This was a discretionary review in which the discretion did lie with the DRB to make that particular judgment. Quite a bit of responsibility was on the DRB in this section because of the linkage to the PDR process and the language mirrored that type of authority and decision-making. In this instance, it was for when somebody asks for something that was different from what was more cut-and-dried in the Open Space Standard, such as for an idea that was not listed in explicit words in this particular set of standards.
 - The personality of the Code was entirely the City’s to direct. The team could go through and tighten up the Code language and include guidelines for the purposes of this section if that was the direction of the Commission.
- The Commission agreed it would be good to tighten up such words, provide guidelines. Because the DRB’s membership changes, Board members did not know what had been decided on previous projects or a part of a project, so it was better to have guidelines to provide more consistency, especially between phases of a development.
 - Some plans were not built as approved because the Planning Department had to accept some things that the developer just could not do, so there was also variation at a later stage in the process than just the DRB decision.
 - Subjective terms provided wiggle room and the opportunity to argue for things. Commissioners and DRB members sought objective, easy-to-measure predictability in the Code, but such provisions provided too

much leeway for someone to get outside of the original goals of what the Commission and City Council wanted because there was too much room without an objective measure.

- Parameters were absolutely needed for the DRB because it was often a matter of how well the applicant presented an alternative to sway the Board when there were no good guidelines or parameters to work within. That could be good for the applicant, but not for sticking with parameters that ensure the quality that the City wanted.
- The City of Wilsonville divided the quasi-judicial and legislative processes. Writing Code belonged to the legislative side and applying the Code was the quasi-judicial part. The language allowed the quasi-judicial to act in place of Code-makers.
- Mr. Dills confirmed the direction was to revise the language toward more clear and objective standards.
- Section 4.127(.03)F (Page 4 of 68) What might this provision mean for anyone who may or may not want to have home-sharing or Airbnb type options for their homes? There had been a lot of conversations recently about the subject, so it might be worth considering in this process to see if it should be revisited.
- Section 4.127 (.02)I. Mr. Neamtzu explained conversations about manufactured homes had been fairly minimal over the years, though a lot occurred around the time of the Thunderbird Mobile Club Park closure. State law required the City to accommodate manufactured housing as a permitted housing type under the Building Code, so this Code section simply mirrored what was already in the PDR standards for permitted uses and ancillary uses. If someone wanted to put a manufactured home in a single-family subdivision, there was a process for that through the Building Department. He did not believe the number of manufactured homes could be limited in an area as doing so might be a violation of fair housing rules.
 - Mr. Neamtzu confirmed the proposed residential design codes would apply to any manufactured home, adding the fundamental difference was whether a home was stick-built on the site or stick-built in a factory and brought to the site.
- Concerns were expressed about the quality of manufactured versus stick-built homes and having a concentration of them in Frog Pond.
 - Mr. Neamtzu stated no one he has spoken to was even contemplating manufactured homes in Frog Pond. He appreciated the concern, but given the lot sizes, price of land and cost of development, it would seem unlikely for a developer to choose that housing type, particularly in the West Neighborhood compared to other parts of Wilsonville.
- On page 1 of 68, Commissioner Springfield noted the very first point on the memo from Don Hanson talked about attached single-family units. He recalls the Commission saying no more than two items to be attached in the single-family category. He noted they were asking four-to-five. He asked whether the Commission just wanted to say no to this or should the Commission consider incorporating this.
- Section 4.127 (.02)C. (Page 1) Mr. Neamtzu clarified that a conscientious decision was made last November after lengthy discussions that the West Neighborhood would be a single-family, detached subdivision, so the Plan did not accommodate four to five attached units as requested in the memo from Otak. He noted the parties were not at the table during those discussions in 2015. He did not believe incorporating that housing type would be genuine to the Concept Plan at this point in time as it would involve going back and reopening the Concept Plan and having those conversations over again.
 - He noted that Staff just received the memo today and he intended to write responses to all of Mr. Hanson's written comments, and explain to him and Mr. Grimberg how the City had arrived at the decision to limit attached dwelling units to two.
 - He clarified duplexes were considered single-family, so as proposed the Code allowed for two, but three attached units was a multi-family housing product that the Plan did not accommodate, so there would be no row homes in the West Neighborhood.

Mr. Dills outlined the revisions to draft Code text and policies presented in the meeting packet, which included Code and Residential Design Standards; Monuments, Gateways, and Signs; and Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments, as noted in the work session agenda provided on Page 1 of 68 of the packet.

Discussion and comments regarding the revised Code language to implement the Frog Pond Master Plan were as follows with responses from the project team as noted:

Code and Residential Design Standards:

- Section 4.127 (0.15)G.a (Page 18 of 68) Vinyl siding was listed as a prohibited material because higher quality than vinyl siding was desired.
- Section 4.127 (0.15)E.q Objective standards were needed if there were variance standards elsewhere. Having the DRB making decisions was one thing, but giving the planning director some leeway was another.
 - As with the other references regarding the DRB's discretion and the need for clear and objective standards, the subject language added a layer of discretion that could actually bypass the DRB. Such subjective standards should not be granted to a single person when the DRB was available, and there was still some discomfort with the DRB having such discretion without objective standards.
 - Mr. Dills explained the language was included to give the director the authority to address individual issues like whether a 46.5 inch front stoop was acceptable as opposed to the 48-inch standard.
 - Giving the director that authority would be like a single property type of variance rather than overall design-type variances for projects. However, the subject Code section addressed a big-picture, multi-home type development and approval process, so the language did not seem to fit.
 - (0.15)E.q should reference (0.15)A, the purpose statement for the Residential Design Standards, "Other items meeting the purpose of this section..." Purpose statements were very important within the Code to express the issue of clear intent the Commission had been discussing.
- Even though much of the proposed Code offered the opportunity for variation, but most of the homes would look pretty similar. Existing homes in the area looked the same, and homes that look very different from the normal Northwest style, like in Villebois, did not sell very well. Other parts of the country had broader variations in architecture.
- In Table 2 on Page 20 of 68, Note I was corrected to state, "...the minimum combined side yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 10 ft."

Monuments, Gateways, and Signs:

- The project team did not have a strong opinion about what the monument at the Boeckman Creek Bridge would state. It could say East Wilsonville. "Frog Pond" applied to the entire 500-acre area of the project. Frog Pond seemed an appropriate way to mark the entrance; but perhaps, it could be done in combination with Boeckman Creek, because it was such an important crossing and connection down toward Town Center and Memorial Park. Any monument language would be consistent with language in the Vision Statement "Integration with the community and a part of Wilsonville".
 - The Commission discussed suggestions about what the monument should state, noting the proximity of Boeckman Creek and the proposed Boeckman Trail. Coffee Creek did not reference Villebois, but the creek.
 - Since Boeckman Rd actually divided old and new development north and south, just focusing on the Frog Pond part, would ignore the people in the other developments on the other side.
 - Having the sign note one was driving into Frog Pond would create confusion since those living in Meadows used the same road to get to Meadows.
 - Boeckman Creek would be great. Villebois probably did not care that about the Coffee Creek monument, but there could be a problem with it stating Frog Pond because might irritate those in Meadows who already had an identity.
 - There were also other opportunities to identify Frog Pond with the two neighborhood gateways.
- Mr. Dills clarified that the Trail Plan included a trailhead for the Boeckman Trail was planned in conjunction with the linear park, which he indicated on the map on Page 24 of 65. From a site-specific sense, it was difficult to know how trail users or pedestrians on Boeckman Rd would get down to the creek until the bridge was redesigned with a set of stairs or sidewalk. The common theme was that there should be a pedestrian access at that juncture, but how that would be done was still unknown.
 - Although no trailhead would be located at the bridge, it was worth signing that one was going over Boeckman Creek, and it would also provide opportunity for environmental education.

- The Welcome to City sign should have some uniformity with other Welcome to Wilsonville signs. The existing Welcome to Wilsonville sign on Wilsonville Rd coming from Sherwood was a wooden monument sign that just stated “City of Wilsonville” and had the old logo.
 - Mr. Neamtzu suggested addressing monuments, gateways, and signage in a more comprehensive way through the wayfinding project currently in the City’s budget. The new City logo could provide a fresh opportunity to brand the City’s monumentation in a great way. Universal Health on the north end of town wanted to identify something there, and the wooden routed monuments at Fox Chase on the west side and next to Landover on Wilsonville Rd were pretty outdated and could use a fresh look. There were also two huge monuments at I-5 and Wilsonville Rd, but nothing at Elligsen Rd.
- At the major Stafford Rd/Boeckman Rd intersection, trees and a more natural approach (Landforms and tall vegetation, Page 35 of 68) was preferred for the enhanced landscaping because it blended better and was more pleasant looking than a big hard structure. One concern was to make Frog Pond another part of Wilsonville and using a large monument there would cut it off from the rest of the city.
 - The visuals of a more natural approach might take away from power lines, too; although there would be some limitations due to the power lines.
- Subordinating subdivision identities within the neighborhood was suggested to avoid detracting from the overall Frog Pond identity. Each development or developer should not decide on their own name and have that as a prominent identification. Neighborhood identities should be subordinated consciously and carefully to the overall identity of Frog Pond so a subdivision’s identity did not overpower the larger neighborhood identity.
 - Villebois provided a parallel example as various builders had sub brands during the development and marketing of their properties, but once built out, it was all Villebois, not a lot of individual neighborhoods. Like Villebois, the City wanted Frog Pond to be a unified, cohesive neighborhood.

Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments:

- Implementation Measure 3.1.11.e (Page 53) When the language in regarding neighborhood parks was written, the idea was that neighborhood parks would be provided and maintained by Home Owners Associations (HOAs) and would not be the City’s responsibility. The Infrastructure Funding Plan for Frog Pond, which was still being developed and would be reviewed by the Commission, took a slightly different direction. The revised language regarding “other entities” reflected that there would be two publicly-maintained parks. Because 15 to 20 developments would be knitted together over time, no single HOA would be created to care for them.
 - The subject language was one of several references where the Code language was broadened to allow for a public strategy in addition to the HOA strategy.
 - Mr. Dills explained that while there was a practical need to broaden the language to allow the Wilsonville Code to be interpreted by future Planning Commissions and City Councils, it could be narrowed to say “HOA or the City”. “Other entities” would allow the City to delegate to some other party, such as a parks district or private party.
- Implementation Measure 4.1.4.u (Page 57) Mr. Neamtzu explained the gaps in the densities were created by a large rewrite of the Code about 15 years ago. Staff’s plan for addressing this complex problem was the Density and Consistency Project. A consultant from APG had helped Staff considerably in teasing apart the City’s standards and building a new process that filled the gaps. Because the Frog Pond project was tied to the actual density standards in the Development Code, the density gaps could not be fixed in the subject language. All of the work to address the issue would be presented in the future as one package.
 - Mr. Dills added a different approach was taken in Frog Pond to streamline the process and be clear about the subdistricts to find minimum and maximum numbers of units.
- Implementation Measure 3.1.11.e (Page 53) The two neighborhood parks and the smaller, open-space tracts in the higher-density, small-lot subdistrict would be maintained by HOAs. It seemed unbalanced that the people with the biggest homes would benefit from the parks, but not have any responsibility for maintaining parks. The smaller tracts and neighborhood parks would not be where the larger homes were located, but those homes would have an HOA and still benefit from the parks.

- Mr. Dills agreed HOAs for small lots with open-space set-asides would have responsibilities that others would not. Open space, stormwater, or other tracts of land were likely to appear in other parts of the community because of design intent by a particular project. There was a proposal for a co-housing project with a central open space. There would undoubtedly be tree grove site design direction and regulation by the City that would place the grove in an open space tract. There would be ownership and maintenance responsibilities in other areas that came from those types of decisions.

Mr. Dills stated the project team was preparing a draft West Frog Pond Master Plan that would be adopted by the City as a supporting document to the Comprehensive Plan. It would contain all the topics discussed by the Commission, from residential design through public realm recommendations. The project team would be working over the next couple of weeks to incorporate the new school proposal and present a 90 percent draft for the Commission's review and discussion at the January meeting. Additional topics or final refinements could be discussed at a work session in February in preparation for a public hearing in March.

- The major revisions resulting from the school's new location would involve changing the central part of the Boeckman Rd frontage, which would no longer be residential on the maps. The project team had gone through the refinements to the Street Demonstration Plan, so only refinements would be needed since the grid the project team set up served the group of properties there very well. The grid was used as the base for the Street Tree Plan, which would change a little bit. The changes would trickle through about 15 different graphics, but the real substance was a different land use at that location.
- He indicated the location of the 10-acre tax lot owned by the school district, and noted the adjacent tax lot, which extended to the Willow Creek swale, was not part of the school district's school designation.

Commissioner Millan asked about the impact of losing some housing on the funding mechanisms for some of the infrastructure.

- Mr. Neamtzu replied Staff had begun researching the System Development Charges (SDCs) paid by schools to be able to recalibrate the analysis that was done. Staff would pull data from employee counts and recently built schools for comparison and show the Commission how everything might impact the bottom line.

Chair Greenfield called for public comment.

James Wolfston, Frog Pond resident, asked how the district's new school would impact the completion date of the plan.

Mr. Neamtzu responded the Master Plan would go to the Planning Commission in March and City Council the following month. He anticipated it would take more than one meeting for the Planning Commission to conclude the public hearing and adopt the Master Plan, but could be adopted by Council as early as May. The City would continue responding to citizen concerns and comments throughout the process.

Ben Altman, Pioneer Design Group, representing Mr. Wolfston, said he supported some of the recommendations from Arbor, in terms of the menu approach to the architectural design, which had been incorporated. It was important to provide flexibility.

- He explained there were two types of manufactured housing, mobile-homes, which were now all called manufactured, and modular designs that were stick-built and assembled in a factory, and then brought to a site to be put together. He anticipated seeing some modular designs because the criteria in the menu would not fit a typical manufactured, mobile-type unit very well. A custom design would be needed to fit into those criteria, so he did not believe it would be a concern.
 - Under the Goal 10 Housing Rule, manufactured housing was a needed housing type and therefore the City must provide for it. It could not be precluded, but specific standards could be adopted. There were already some standards in the Code about mobile-type units, but no standards addressed modular units, which fell more under the conventional stick-built home.
- The language of the Code language must provide for "rigid flexibility." The Code had some rigidity to it in terms of the overall guidance needed, which was how the current PDR section came about. The standard R5/R7 zones were very prescriptive and some flexibility was needed. The planned development section was

created to allow less rigid requirements, but development had to stay within the provided guidelines, which came back to the Purpose Statement that drives all that. The Commission was headed in the right direction, but some flexibility had to be maintained.

- The current menu had enough choices to provide variety. The reason everything looked the same was because many of the code standards were too tight. If only five, six or eight options were provided, a lack of variety would result, and every third house would look the same. More flexibility in the menu criteria would result in a better variety.
- He supported the idea of maintaining Frog Pond as the overall name. There would need to be some ways to create additions, phases, or neighborhoods within Frog Pond because a plat name was part of the platting requirements; for example, Frog Pond Phase 1, 2 and 3, or Addition 1, 2, etc. It made sense to have an overall name, like Villebois, because the Frog Pond neighborhood would have the same character.
- The new primary school site essentially added a third neighborhood park, which should be considered in the context of the small lot to see how much open space needed to spill over. Accessibility to open space was an issue, but the smaller lots were also closer to Boeckman Creek, which was all open space. He was concerned about adding open space on top of open space. He suggested revisiting the open space in the context of now having the school within the neighborhood.

Don Hanson, Otak, representing West Hills, stated he would work through the items in his memorandum with Staff, but would not go through them in detail this evening. He had proposed that more than two attached units might be a possibility, but now sensed that was not the case, adding he was fortunate to not have been involved in the 2015 discussions.

- He believed Mr. Altman's comments about open space and the school site were well taken. The school would be in a good, walkable location. Young students living in the neighborhood could get there safely. They were looking forward to the new school location and hoped open space could be revisited, not from square one, but in terms of refinements.
- He found Commissioner Postma's comments on objective standards for the DRB very compelling. The more clear and objective the standards, the better for the Panel as well as the applicants. They would know what they were responding to and how to design their projects. He noted there were always exceptions and that was why the Purpose Statements in the Code were relied upon.
- He loved the ideas regarding monument signs for the neighborhood and agreed that the more it could be cohesive and just identify the neighborhood, the better. It was okay as long as there could still be some marketing signs during the build out. Having it all under the Frog Pond banner was the way to go as Frog Pond was a cool name.
- He was happy to hear about the new timeline and now that the school district had committed, Staff could move forward in collaboration with them.

C. Transit Master Plan (Lashbrook)

Stephan Lashbrook, SMART Transit Director, stated he was primarily before the Commission to set the stage for the public hearing in March on the new Transit Master Plan (TMP). Staff had been working on the TMP for about four years, and this last year, a self-appointed and very dedicated citizen task force had been involved. There was a lot of potential for controversy at the public, especially among serious transit riders, as SMART was discussing making changes to routes and schedules.

- The TMP was a subset of the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) which was a subset of the Comprehensive Plan. The TMP was not regulatory, but a guidance document for SMART, City Council, and the Budget Committee when making decisions about SMART's investments. In some ways, the TMP was more of a financial document than a typical planning document.
 - One key aspect was that the TMP put the City in a position to secure grant funding. SMART was funded primarily through local payroll taxes but also received grants from Clackamas County, Metro, ODOT, and sometimes from federal highway money, but usually Federal Transit Administration money.

- Almost invariably, grant applications discussed local planning and public outreach processes, so it was very important to show that the TMP was adopted by City Council through a specific public process and identified how grant money would be used.
- He reviewed the roles of the Planning Commission in the review process, which included acting as the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) to ensure adequate public involvement and determining whether the new Master Plan complied with the TSP and Comprehensive Plan or created any conflicts that needed to be resolved. Some conflicts, such as those related to route and schedule changes, could be forwarded for City Council to resolve.
- He noted more than 1,300 comments were received and summarized two key suggestions that were guiding the TMP as it was being finalized as follows:
 - Increase ridership versus coverage of the transit system by having more buses focused on main avenues and connection points for more frequency on routes and fewer stops dispersed throughout the community. This would result more people having to get to the buses, but he did not see drastic changes to the system as Dial-a-Ride provided services to any house in town if the rider qualified.
 - Increase the connections between Wilsonville and other cities rather than service within the City.
- As a result of increased PERS costs, SMART would have an \$85,000 hit to the budget next year, increasing to at least \$100,000 within two years; a substantial amount for a small transit agency as \$100,000 paid for bus and driver for an eight-hour shift, which was a lot of service.
 - Fortunately, payroll taxes in the community were stable and gradually on the incline. More jobs in the community would fund more service for transit in the future. The redevelopment of the Xerox site and the potential for new development on the Mentor Graphics property south of Boeckman Road meant new revenue potential for SMART.
- There was also complete uncertainty about revenue sources. No one could anticipate the level of transportation funding from the federal government. In any given year, that could mean a \$1 million impact on SMART's budget.
- Staff's approach to the TMP was different from most transit plans, which were usually a compilation of intended tasks and projects for when more money was available. Instead, the new TSP would also provide specific recommendations to City Council for cuts to be made in a certain order if less money was available.
 - If there was a steady stream of money, and the PERS obligations could be covered, very few changes would be made. If more money became available through a State transportation package or a new, large industry moved in with 5,000 highly paid employees, transit service would be increased for the community.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked if the TMP included plans to increase funding by taxation or other avenues.
 - Mr. Lashbrook responded the TMP would include a menu of possible funding sources but no specific recommendation about utilizing any particular source. He added one of the clearest statements from the 1300 comments was from the local business community strongly stating they had done their share and to look elsewhere for additional funds.
- Stated a big concern among the business community was the impetus toward more service, which meant more money, and the easy target was those who did not have a direct vote, which had always been his concern. There were all these plans for business growth and construction in places by Day Road, Coffee Creek and Basalt Creek, but to what effect if their taxes were increased with the notion that they would not be distributed elsewhere.
- Noted were other discussions with Mr. Lashbrook about the inefficiencies of fare boxes, etc. but there were routes other than expecting businesses to foot the entire bill if services were increased. Small businesses were a big engine for the community. He was concerned that increased services without conscientiousness toward small businesses would have a negative impact on the community's ability to attract small businesses to Wilsonville.

Mr. Lashbrook confirmed the SMART payroll tax applied to all businesses and some units of government uniformly, regardless of their size, traffic volumes, etc.; however, the set rate did not apply to non-profits, schools, churches, etc. SMART's payroll tax rate was .5 percent. TriMet's rate was .737 percent.

- Wilsonville's job base was one reason why SMART existed and why it had been able to provide services for so many years. He believed the taxable payroll in Wilsonville was more than \$900 million.
- He concluded that he hoped to have the draft TMP for the Commission in a few weeks, adding he would move forward with scheduling the public hearing as soon as possible.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2017 Planning Commission Work Program

Commissioner Levit recalled that City Council was trying to come up with some plans to alleviate traffic on Wilsonville Rd, suggesting the installation of cameras. He noticed recently that more drivers blatantly running red lights and block intersections. It was getting to a point where drivers running red lights were an expected outcome. He asked what the City planned to do.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated there had been a lot of discussion on the topic, which City Council raised regularly in work sessions. He knew a staff member was assigned to work on the red light problem and report back to Council for a much more comprehensive look at the camera program. The cameras in Sherwood on Hwy 99 had significantly cut back on red light running incidents.

- The City did add a lot of additional signage stating, "Do not block intersection", such as at the Boones Ferry/Wilsonville Rd interchange.
- There had been a lot of conversation with the police force to increase enforcement. He had just met the new police chief, who would be brought up to speed on the issue.
- He agreed to communicate the Commission's concerns to Council.
- He clarified that the existing cameras in the City were ODOT cameras that monitored traffic and signaled the lights; they were not used for enforcement. He described the camera system used in Sherwood at two Hwy 99 intersections. The thousands of photos taken were fielded by a company in Arizona. The system created a tremendous amount of work because somebody had to determine the validity of the violation at the local level, and then coordinate with the national companies running the cameras and doing the actual distribution of the violations through the mail.
 - The reduction in red-light running was clear, but a tremendous amount of effort and investment was involved. Some areas installed the cameras for revenue, but revenue decreased as drivers stopped running red lights.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, Assistant City Attorney, added that the Wilsonville contract with Clackamas County Sheriff's Office had a dedicated traffic officer, but other deputies could still issue citations. More monitoring had also been occurring.

- A possible concern was that when traffic cameras were implemented, an officer had to sign off on it. It needed to be determined whether Wilsonville needed to get an additional person from Clackamas County to cover that or if Wilsonville's traffic officer could handle it.
- She offered to provide a report for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Millan preferred having a short update during a Commission meeting. Red light running had become a common problem and many citizens were very concerned. She would like to understand the options being considered, knowing it would help the Commission, especially given the Town Center and Frog Pond Master Plans as well as the TMP. The hope was to reduce traffic, but if that did not happen, the TMP was lacking something.

Commissioner Springall noted that throughout the election cycle, people felt they were not being heard. Traffic was a huge issue and some have asked what forum was available to explain to concerned citizens about what was being done. The Planning Commission was the CCI, and they were not talking about the issue.

Commissioner Levit believed there were two separate issues. Traffic could be reduced, but that would not stop drivers from running red lights. People violated laws to avoid the traffic congestion.

Chair Greenfield commented that he hoped Wilsonville would not have a celebrated road rage case.

Mr. Neamtzu thanked the Commissioners for their flexibility in meeting so close to Christmas.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Tami Bergeron, Administrative Assistant - Planning