

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020
6:00 P.M.**

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

Meeting Minutes were
reviewed and approved at the
May 13, 2020 PC Meeting

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Kamran Mesbah called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Kamran Mesbah, Ron Heberlein, Jerry Greenfield, Simon Springall, Phyllis Millan, Aaron Woods, and Jennifer Willard

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, and Philip Bradford

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.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Consideration of the February 12, 2020 Planning Commission minutes

The following corrections and clarifications were made to the February 12, 2020 minutes:

(Note: added language in bold, italicized text; deleted language struck through)

- Page 1, Planning Commission Roll Call, "Simon Springall arrived during **Citizen Input.**"
- Page 3, fourth sentence of Commissioner Greenfield's comments, "A very current and important study by Dr. Raj Chetty on the effect of housing **on** neighborhoods, in the sense of neighbors and the proximity of neighbors, in the early ~~of~~ development of children."
- Page 5, fourth bullet, second sentence, "...that million dollar houses were **in adequate** supply."
- Page 8, eleventh bullet, fourth sentence, "What was the cost **versus** benefit?"
- Page 9, fourth bullet, second sentence, "The metrics ~~they~~ **need to** be easily updateable and..."

Commissioner Heberlein moved to approve the February 12, 2020 as amended on the record. Commissioner Springall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

II. LEGISLATIVE HEARING

A. Residential Zoning Standards Modernization Project (Pauly)

Chair Mesbah read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:12 pm.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, stated at this point, the Residential Code Modernization Project could almost introduce itself given the five work sessions with the Planning Commission and two work sessions with City Council. She believed it was important to note what the project was not because there was a lot of conversation happening at the State level and among many cities about housing work related to recent State legislative changes.

- This project was not a comprehensive look at Wilsonville's housing program or the zoning of all the City's housing zones, and it did not reflect on HB 2001 or HB 2003. The project regarded how the City's PDR zones had been operating and implemented over time, as well as the inconsistencies that had been noticed and clarifications proposed. Applicants could be made aware of how different things were calculated and could better understand those Code elements, reducing the need to go through the subjective waiver process. The project would also align some of the items that took up space on a lot and ensure those were able to be built on, in particular, related the remaining lots in the city that were zoned PDR. It was important for people to know the project was very limited in scope and that work related to HB 2001 and HB 2003 would be considered in the coming couple of years.
- She introduced Daniel Pauly, who would walk through the work completed and remind the Commission about the discussions had to date for the benefit of the record and anyone listening at home, adding that he would be providing updates based on the Council work session.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on Page 64 and 65 of the packet, which were pages 1 and 2 of Attachment 4 to the Staff report. Copies of the report were made available on the side of the room.

Mr. Pauly presented the Residential Zoning Standards Modernization Project via PowerPoint, highlighting the project's purpose and proposed amendments, as well as the recent updates made since the last Planning Commission work session (Attachment 2), all of which were based on feedback from City Council over its two work sessions, as well as additional review by Staff. His comments were as follows:

- The purpose of the project could be summarized in the following four points (Slide 3):
 - Excellence and Continuous Improvement, which was a City Council goal. Most of the standards being addressed were 20 years old. During that time, customers and Staff had found areas for improvement, and it was good practice to address such items as needed. The proposal focused on updates expected to have the greatest impacts on areas likely to be developed or redeveloped in the coming years.
 - Clear and Objective Standards, which was driven by State law. While some code lacked clarity, Staff and decision makers had been careful to implement the code in a spirit of clear and objective standards as seen by the variety of housing found in Wilsonville. Staff had seen greater scrutiny of housing related reviews and decisions from State and other interested parties, which was anticipated to continue. So it was important to make the Code more clear and objective where possible.
 - Staff and decision makers, as well as other community members, appreciated things that were more clear and objective, so everyone could be on the same page. Many Planning Commissioners had served on DRB and had worked through some subjective waivers with little guidance from the Code, and this proposal looked to minimize those subjective situations.
 - Feasible Implementation. Some of the requirements could exceed the available land at times. Part of this proposal made changes to allow the math to work under most circumstances in order to allow reasonable development.
 - Accommodate Smaller Projects. Much of Wilsonville had developed as relatively large developments, and the current standards were well-suited for those large-scale projects. Currently, only a couple larger sites remained with PDR zoning, with a number of smaller vacant or redevelopment sites around town, as the city had matured to a level of seeing smaller redevelopment or infill projects. The proposal updated the standards to ensure the land-consuming requirements worked on smaller sites while still accommodating larger sites.
- The proposal was most applicable to about 63 acres of PDR-zoned land currently within city limits, and could pertain to future annexed areas outside of Frog Pond, particularly the urban reserve areas south of Wilsonville Rd, west of Willamette Way West, and north of Villebois. (Slide 8)
- The proposed updates were grouped into two main topic areas: Density Calculations and Lot Size, and Open Space Requirements. He described the proposed changes regarding each topic area as follows:
- Density Calculations and Lot Size

- Fix inconsistencies identified over the years was generally done by correcting some text.
- One inconsistency between the Comprehensive Plan Map and Comprehensive Plan text was corrected by changing the text to read 16–20 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) to be consistent with what the Map currently stated and with the Metropolitan Housing Rule, which required minimum density to be 80% of the maximum density. It was clear that was the intent all along, so the change was basically a scrivener's error correction.
- Another inconsistency was between the Comprehensive Plan text and Development Code text as it related to the correlation between Comprehensive Plan densities and PDR Zones. The idea was to implement the Comprehensive Plan density with one of the PDR Zones.
 - One example of the inconsistencies found in the current Code was that for 10-12 du/ac, the Comprehensive Plan text stated the zoning possibilities would be PDR-3 or PDR-4, while the Development Code stated the zone should go to PDR-5.
 - The proposal was to move the residential zone references in the Comprehensive Plan and update the correlation table and the zoning standard to have one uniform table to show the correlation. The updated table reflected the correlation consistent with how the Code had been interpreted by the City in land use approvals over the last number of years.
 - Since the last work session, Staff changed the maximum density for PDR-7 to at least 25 from 20, because at 20, the density was essentially the same as PDR-6. Currently, no property in the City was zoned PDR-7, nor any property with a Comprehensive Plan designation that would correlate with PDR-7 in the future.
- Clarifying the calculation of allowed density.
 - Density was a sensitive topic, and no change in policy was being made. The idea was to have the code match the interpretation how the code had been implemented over the last number of years, and to clearly outline the calculation being used in the code so applicants would be clear from the beginning of the process.
 - The proposal clarified density calculation as based on a new defined term called, "Gross Development Area" of a residential master plan, which was the total area minus the City's Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ), shown in green, and/or within the Bonneville Power Administration power line transmission easement, shown in the fuchsia in the example on Slide 16.
 - The proposal was consistent with the approach in the Residential Neighborhood Zone, which had been applied to Frog Pond, as well as how buildable lands and residential capacity were calculated for housing forecasting and housing compliance purposes. It was also consistent with how it had been applied historically.
 - Since the last work session, the term, "Gross Buildable Area" had been changed to "Gross Development Area" to clarify that the land included areas that might not be buildable or built upon.
- Ensure that land consuming requirements did not exceed available land
 - Sometimes it was not mathematically possible to meet all the current standards that consumed land. Such standards included density, minimum lot size, minimum amount of open space, requirements for streets and other infrastructure, and standards for stormwater treatment areas.
 - The proposal looked at minimum lot size and open space requirements particularly, in an effort to allow the math to work under typical development circumstances. The remaining requirements, such as density, right-of-way and stormwater areas, were not flexible, so no changes were proposed.
 - Based on the City' priority to maintain open space requirements, updating minimum lot sizes within the various zones was the first variable considered. To determine the proposed minimum lot size for each zone, Staff used a hypothetical 10 acre site, subtracted right-of-way and the required open space, and then divided the result by the maximum density, which helped identify a more accurate lot size that fit with all of the other variables that need to be considered in designing a site and made it more likely that the math would work for most developments. (Slide 19)

- Adjustments: even with changes to the minimum lot sizes, the math might still not work, so the subjective waivers under the current code would need to be relied upon. For those scenarios, the proposal was a new, predictable adjustment process that would address lot size and open space, and prioritized the provision of open space. All adjustments would be to the minimum extent necessary to allow the math to work. (Slide 20)
 - The adjustment process would first allow up to 20 percent of lots to have their lot sizes reduced by 20 percent below the zone minimum. Once the lot size adjustments were maxed-out, reduction of open space areas would be allowed, beginning with non-useable open space. The removal of all open space would not be allowed, as the code required a minimum open space size in all scenarios.
 - Based on feedback while working with City Council, additional language had been added to the adjustment language to clarify that preservation of open space was prioritized, and open space adjustments would only occur after lot size adjustments were maximized.
- Present the lot standards in the code in the best way to be clear to both applicants and reviewers
 - Newer residential standards, including the Residential Neighborhood Zone and Village Zone standards, were presented in a table format. The proposal took seven repetitive subsections of text in the code and converted them into a single table. (Slide 22)
- Open Space Requirements
 - How much open space should be required?
 - He presented a few visual examples of different sizes of open spaces that might be familiar to the Commissioners and community. (Slide 25) The photos featured the approximate 1/4-acre greenspace along Orleans Ave in Villebois, 1/2-acre of open space in the neighborhood park at Arbor Crossing, and 1-acre of Walt Morey Park in Morey's Landing.
 - The City currently used a tiered approach to determine how much useable open space was required in a neighborhood. The current tiered standards required 1/4-acre of useable open space for any subdivision with 50 or fewer lots. Even if a large amount of open space was preserved in the SROZ, an additional 1/4-acre still had to be preserved outside of the SROZ. The standards had been difficult to meet for a number of smaller subdivisions, particularly those under 10 lots, and especially those that also had a large percentage of natural area on the site.
 - While the total open space requirement of 25 percent would not be changing, the proposal was to move from the current tiered approach to a percentage approach to determine the requirement for both for the overall open space and for the useable open space. Regardless of the size of the project, the proportion of open space would remain approximately the same, which was similar to the methodology developed for the Residential Neighborhood Zone.
 - The proposal was for the size of open space to be equal to 25 percent of the size of the Gross Development Area. For example, a 1/4-acre of open space would be required of the two-acre site shown in Slide 26 that had one acre of Gross Development Area. He reiterated that the Gross Development Area excluded the SROZ shown in green and the BPA easement shown in fuchsia.
 - Based on discussions with the Planning Commission and City Council over the past few years, minimum provisions for useable open space had been included. Following additional discussion and direction from Council, this was updated to reflect that half of the total required open space must be designated useable. In the scenario on Slide 27, that would be 1/8-acre, or about 5,400 sf. Under the proposal discussed at previous work sessions, the total would have been 2,000 sf of useable space.
 - Also after City Council discussion and direction, the previous proposal to allow 10 percent of lots that were 6,000 sf or more to count as part of the required open space was removed. He noted that few, if any, 6,000 sf lots were anticipated on the existing undeveloped areas in the city where the proposed changes would apply, mainly due to the planned density in those

areas. Council's direction was to continue to prioritize common open space over any private open space.

- Both updates to have area outside the SROZ being useable and the elimination of the yard, reflected City Council desire to require a high level of common open space similar to Villebois and other recent developments, which was something the Commission had voiced over the years as well.
- The updated modification attempted to balance the continued policy direction, while making smaller developments with a significant amount of SROZ mathematically feasible.
- While open space was based on the Gross Development Area, not all of the open space had to be in the Gross Development Area portion of the site. As outlined in the existing code, land in the SROZ could count as open space; however, as seen in a number of existing developments, the useable space needed to be outside of the SROZ, but could be located in the BPA easement.
 - The illustration on Slide 27 showed the Any Open Space in the SROZ portion of the site, which freed up area in the Gross Development Area for additional housing potentially.
- Does open space add value?
 - Over the years of required open space in neighborhoods, a number of situations had arisen where small, odd-shaped, or under-utilized open spaces had become a liability for homeowners associations without providing the value of a better-designed open space.
 - The proposed changes established a minimum size for individual open space tracts or areas and required that useable open spaces be designed by appropriately credentialed and experienced landscape architect. Additionally, where habitat was preserved or created, ensure it was connected to other wildlife habitats in order to function properly.
- He highlighted the substantial changes made since the last work session (Slide 30):
- Language was added emphasizing that lot size adjustments occur prior to any open space adjustments in order to prioritize common open space.
- Clear language now existed requiring that half of the 25 percent open space must be useable.
- Any previously proposed provisions for private yards to count as part of the required open space were removed.
- The SROZ density transfer language was updated so it was clear and correlated with the language in Section 4.124.
- He thanked the Commissioners for their participation in the many long work sessions on the project. Many details had been worked through, and he appreciated the expertise of the Planning Commission. The changes were important because they allowed for the efficient use of the residential land that remained within the city, while continuing to encourage quality, well-designed neighborhoods that had become the hallmark of the community.
- Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to City Council to adopt the proposed Residential Zoning Standards updates.

Chair Mesbah called for any questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Millan stated she was very happy to see the tables versus a lot of text, which looked very good. She also supported the change regarding no private yards counting as required open space and applauded the effort to make that happen. She was happy with the proposed changes and thanked Mr. Pauly for his work.

Commissioner Greenfield:

- Noted it would be difficult to keep up with the amount of details involved, and Mr. Pauly had done a marvelous job with that. He especially appreciated the orderly way in which the issues and the choices that had been made were laid out, as well as the reasons for those decisions.
- Noted that in certain areas where the minimum lot size did not pencil out and adjustments were necessary, the language regarding the adjustment process on page 9 of 70 of the Staff report (Page 3 of 4,

Attachment 1) stated, "20 percent of the lots can be reduced in size by 20 percent as necessary to ensure density standards are met. Once lot reduction is maximized, required minimum open space may be reduced to ensure density standards are met." He was not exactly sure how that worked.

- Secondly, he asked was the first recourse was not to simply drop a lot and increase the size of the remaining lots—not to change the minimum lot size, but rather the actual lot size, so the math would work.
- Mr. Pauly responded that scenario assumed the development might already be at the minimum required number of units, which could be reduced or waived through the Code due to Metro and State requirements. The only variables that could be played with in that scenario were lot size and open space. The variable of number of units could not be changed. He confirmed that falling under the required number of units would fall under the required minimum density.
- One unfortunate consequence could take place according to the last sentence, "Once lot reduction is maximized, the required minimum open space area may be reduced to ensure density standards are met." He understood the need to ensure density standards, but diminished open space would be an unfortunate consequence. He wished there were a way around that particular problem.
 - Mr. Pauly responded that the only scenario he could see where that would happen would be because most of the property was already preserved as open space
- Noted City Council had weighed in on the issue of using private yards as part of the open space requirement, and he strongly applauded its decision.

Chair Mesbah noted there was no one present in the audience for public testimony and closed the public hearing at 6:37 pm.

Commissioner Springall moved to adopt Resolution No. LP20-0001. Commissioner Greenfield seconded the motion.

Chair Mesbah called for discussion.

Commissioner Springall stated he had missed the City Council meeting when the code project was discussed, but he was very glad with the changes Council had been made. He had spoken several times during the Planning Commission meetings about preferring public open space as opposed to back yards, and he recalled discussion among the Commissioners at that time. He was also very happy to see the considerations regarding what useable open space actually was, noting he used to live in a neighborhood with open space lots that were not considered useable and were a burden to the HOA. He liked the specification in the code because he understood how open space could be developed without adding any value. He also liked the idea of including habitat corridors as a part of the value of open space to the non-human population of the city as well. He thanked Staff for a job well done.

Commissioner Willard asked how long the Commission had been reviewing this particular project.

- Mr. Pauly believed the first work session was last April, but planners, who had since retired, had been working on it as well.

Chair Mesbah agreed the issue of back yards as open space had been discussed as mentioned, and the Commission visited the different functions of open space. An open back yard provided the visual function of an open space, but not much more. Noting how many Commissioners strongly supported the changes that Council effected, he was curious why the issue had not been discussed more strongly during the Commission's discussions. At the time, it seemed the Commission was kind of lukewarm about the matter.

Commissioner Springall believed the prioritization that Mr. Pauly had described helped clarify that the open space should be prioritized above the lot size. He recalled the Commission had gone around a few times discussing that and that some former Commissioners were leaning toward the private open space viewpoint.

Commissioner Greenfield stated he was present at the work session where Council had made these last suggestions, and he noted that the input of the Planning Commission was duly acknowledged.

The motion passed unanimously.

III. WORK SESSION

A. I-5 Pedestrian Bridge (Weigel)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, reminded all that the pedestrian bridge project had a long history with the City. The money for the design work was received from Metro a couple years ago, around the same time that the Town Center planning project was launched, but the bridge design was put on hold in order to better understand the community vision for the Town Center, and any visual or design preferences that would come out of that process. During the Town Center planning process, the pedestrian bridge was elevated to a framework project in the Town Center (T.C.) Plan. It offered key ways to achieve the goals laid out in the T.C. Plan related to connectivity, place-making, and economic opportunities. The community had said this was a key project for getting in and out of the Town Center, especially from a multi-modal perspective, and also provided a way to create a gateway to the Town Center, as well as a community gathering space, which was a key goal in the Town Center Plan as well.

- The goal of this project was to get to 90% project design for the bridge and plaza, which were prioritized during the Town Center project, and this would be the first implementation project from the Town Center Plan. The Planning Commission's role was critical on this project. Most of the Commissioners participated a lot on the Town Center Plan project, being on the task force, at the workshops, or volunteering at events. As this project moved forward, the project team would come to the Commission at key moments and critical milestones and ask the Commission to ensure that the project reflected the goals of the Town Center Plan, as well as the City's Comprehensive Plan, to ensure it was upholding those values and objectives.
- As the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI), the Commission would also be interested in the outreach for this project. While the level of outreach done for the Town Center Plan would probably not be achieved on any project again, the City wanted the Commission to help ensure the outreach done for the pedestrian bridge and plaza was consistent with that done for the Town Center Plan, and to continue to engage the community on this project, since it was key project coming out of the Town Center Plan planning effort.
- She introduced the project team, noting MIG was supporting Dowl on public outreach and landscape architecture.

Zach Weigel, Capital Projects Engineering Manager, presented the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge project via PowerPoint, reviewing the project's background, goals, major design considerations and schedule. He noted the project team would be presenting the project to City Council next week and, based on feedback from the online survey and open house, sought input to questions regarding the bridge types to evaluate and the prioritization of the design principles and themes, as well as the bridge and plaza qualities. (Slide 3)

Alex Dupey, MIG, continued the presentation, describing the public outreach done via a public open house and an online survey conducted through *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* to get input about the community's vision for the bridge and to provide direction to the design team on narrowing the design options. The questions asked during public outreach referenced the Town Center Plan Goals (Slide 10), centering on design priorities, theme and identity, and vision. The pedestrian bridge project would begin implementing the goals ingrained within the Town Center Plan. The public input received informed the five guiding principles for the bridge's design (Slide 16).

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission on the draft Design Principles was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- A big part of the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge was connectivity and addressing how I-5 significantly bisected the City. More than linking the Emerald Chain, the bridge would link the City in an active connectivity manner and provide greater access to Town Center for community members who might not be able to cross I-5 any

other way. The project team should look at the larger picture of connecting east and west Wilsonville to each other, not just to the Town Center.

- The description “Link the Emerald Chain” might resonate with those who helped develop the Town Center Plan, but not most community members. It was not the most important linkage element.
- The bridge would be critical to the economic success of Town Center because it would enable access for many more people who might otherwise have difficulty getting to Town Center.
- No cost information had been presented, perhaps because it was too early in the process. Considering comments heard at the open house and from the community about the cost of the bridge, it was important to educate the public on the broader benefits of the bridge, beyond a cost-per-crossing as if it were a toll bridge. The bridge would make the city function better in many ways, and the project team should be able to quantify, or at least, qualify those benefits. Perhaps, issues of cost were part of prioritizing functionality.
 - Mr. Dupey said comments in the open ended survey comments said the bridge was too expensive, and that the City should be filling potholes. Other comments said the bridge should be beautiful and very inexpensive. At the principle level, the project team tried to use the term, functionality, to try to capture some of the cost implications without getting into what the City expected to spend. Certainly, there would be cost differences with some of the different bridge elements, but he did not want to be limited by cost without exploring some of those options.
- Balancing artistic and cost effectiveness was a struggle. When considering the draft design principles, prioritizing functionality and including some language recognizing the need to be mindful of cost; not that it would necessarily drive the decision, but to at least mindful of it, was suggested.
 - The focus should not solely be on cost at the expense of the artistic benefits. It was a tenuous balance. Everyone wanted something beautiful but cheap. Thinking about what prioritizing functionality meant more fully might address some of the concerns.
- One focus of the Town Center goals and plans was economic prosperity, which did not seem to be captured, except perhaps in linking the Emerald Chain; however, linking beyond the Emerald Chain should be referenced. For example, people could use transit and walk over the bridge to events in Town Center rather than having to drive and park. The piece about building that economic driver for Town Center needed to be included.
 - The economic prosperity of the Town Center was part of the bridge’s benefit.
- The Draft Design Principles did not specifically mention anything about connecting the east side of the City to transit on the west side.
- The transit connection seemed to be part of the broader discussion of functionality; the functions that the bridge would facilitate.
 - Mr. Dupey agreed a broader rewording of linking the Emerald Chain could be used to incorporate the broader linkages to transit or other modes. A big reason for the bridge was to connect the transit center to Town Center.
 - A functional map or infographic showing all the connections the bridge could facilitate in one picture would be beneficial.
- Framing the connections with “transit” and not “train station” was important because the buses were centered at the transit center. There was no room in Town Center for a bus hub. Only about two buses went through Town Center, but the bridge would make all the other bus routes more accessible to the Town Center.

Mr. Dupey continued the presentation with additional comments from Bob Goodrich, Project Manager at Dowl. The public input received on the various bridge design types, bridge amenities, and plaza design elements were reviewed and summarized. Public feedback about the priorities for the bridge design and elements were fairly unified and pointed in a general direction, which was helpful to the project team.

Commissioner comments and suggestions regarding the bridge types to evaluate and the bridge and plaza qualities to prioritize were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Some features recommended by the public could help with noise abatement. The plaza would surely be fairly noisy given all the concrete shown in the images. Plantings help dampen noise, so perhaps living walls with plantings could help dampen the noise and be a beautiful and functional element.
- Concern was expressed about the bridge's height over I-5, the ramp grade necessary to access the bridge, and the space needed to accommodate the ramp. Would children with training wheels on their bicycles and people in wheelchairs and walkers be able to use the bridge? If not, some people would be forced to use a different route, which meant the bridge would not meet the goals of the City.
- Mr. Weigel clarified that the bridge must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, which had specific grade requirements to accommodate wheelchairs, and the project team's goal was a less than 5 percent grade. Mr. Goodrich and his team were looking at the design of the ramps, which they hoped to keep as short as possible, but that all depended on the height of the bridge. Bikes could access anything wheelchairs could, and the team would also be following bicycle guidelines for turning on curves as well.
- It was surprising that the gateway to the metro area was not identified as a higher priority for people, since Wilsonville was a traffic gateway to the metro area. The bridge would an opportunity to provide a different milestone or marker or to evoke a different mood as people came into the metro area.
 - Mr. Dupey agreed, but suggested the wording might have been a factor. Perhaps using "gateway to Wilsonville" would evoke a different response. He agreed the I-5 corridor was the major road for the entire West Coast, and so was a type of gateway.
 - A gateway was the way in, and I-5 went over the bridge and through Wilsonville, not into it. If the bridge was at Wilsonville Rd or Elligsen Rd, the gateway concept might make more sense. Travelers going under the bridge were not likely stopping at Wilsonville.
 - Many comments heard at the Open House were that this was the wrong place for a "Gateway to Wilsonville".
 - Having a gateway at the plaza welcoming people to Town Center had also been mentioned, but that might not be appropriate either. While Town Center would have a theme and certain walkability elements not found in the rest of town, it might extend toward the transit center in the future, so that area might have more of a transit-oriented development 'gateway', similar to the Town Center itself.
- The plaza should be accessible and a meeting point. Cyclist amenities could be located elsewhere in Town Center, not right in the plaza. (Slide 36)
- Mr. Dupey noted 'social seating,' a place to rest or space to congregate, had ranked highly with respondents so far, but it was not clear what form that seating would take.
 - He added that the bridge design would impact how the plaza functioned, so the project team was considering how the two would relate to one another.
- Security did not appear to have been considered overtly in the planning. The bridge needed to feel safe, which was surely at the forefront for everyone doing the planning. As a bridge over a busy highway, safety had to be a top priority to make sure people were safe, so open bridge designs were a concern.
- Existing standards likely addressed safety measures for bridges over highways, so that would be addressed.
- People were likely most enthusiastic about the plaza because that would be the destination where people congregate and do activities. No one was going to linger over I-5. Even if the bridge itself had a beautiful design, people would move fairly quickly across the bridge to the plaza, so people might have more energy about planning the amenities of the plaza than the bridge.
 - If there was a view of the mountains from the bridge, people might want to stop to enjoy the view.
- It was surprising that people were not concerned with having shade or a rain shelter on the bridge. Overall, it seemed most people wanted to make the bridge attractive, but also wanted to be practical financially and not go overboard with the design. Mostly positive comments had been heard from the public about the overall plan.
- Mr. Weigel confirmed the project team would provide draft designs for the three most popular bridge types, as well as three alternatives for plaza designs based on the feedback received. (Slide 32)

- Including cost estimates with the bridge form choices might likely have resulted in significantly different outcomes as people voted and would have provided transparency about the potential costs involved. Including a basic bridge design with a potentially significant cost reduction over the other options would show that the City was being mindful of taxpayer dollars. The focus of the bridge design should be to benefit its users, not those driving under it.
- Commissioner Heberlein liked the arching-simple bridge type.
- Mr. Weigel explained that a basic bridge was not necessarily less expensive. Basic bridge designs often meant the structure was under the bridge deck, making the bridge higher overall and the ramps longer; whereas some designs with the structure above the bridge would not have some of those additional challenges.
 - Mr. Goodrich agreed, adding there was a minimum required clearance over I-5, so having more structure under the bridge required the bridge to be higher in the air, resulting in longer ramps and a smaller area for the plaza due to that space required for the ramps on either side of the bridge.
 - Mr. Weigel added that the project team was working on all the options with a budget in mind. The original budget provided in the grant funding process was \$12 million, and adding the plaza added another \$2 million or so.
- There was something very unnatural about standing above very busy and fast traffic, so people were unlikely to linger on the bridge, even if it was enclosed. Being over I-5, nothing could be done about the busy traffic underneath the bridge.
 - Additionally, an enclosed bridge might seem less safe for pedestrians since the inside of the tunnel structure would not be visible from the outside.
- Having some greenery to help filter noise and air pollution would be valuable.
- People at the open house did not choose bridge amenities involving stopping points and seating, probably for the reasons mentioned. The resting point should be the plaza, not the bridge.
 - The bridge was not a safe place to sit and linger given all fumes from the traffic going underneath.
 - Mr. Dupey noted the value of asking such questions was to get a clear answer from the public about their priorities. The public seemed more interested in placing gathering or seating areas in the plaza or at the ends of the bridge, not in the middle of the span.
 - He agreed there were opportunities for stormwater and vertical plantings, which would add value to the project functionally and aesthetically, and that also honored the goals for Town Center and the City's environmental principles. Incorporation of the bridge and plaza design elements would begin to be seen as concept plans were developed.
- It was difficult to treat the bridge project as a gateway since it was for pedestrians and bicycles, not vehicles. Gateway suggested more transportation.
- Consideration should be given to how this bridge would be seen in the context of the other two bridges. Being new, the bridge would be more contemporary, but should this be an iconic bridge? Was this where the City wanted an iconic bridge for Wilsonville?
 - The Tilikum Bridge was certainly iconic for Portland, despite not being right at the entrance to the city. How the bridge could be made distinctive without making it monumental, since it would stick out like a sore thumb in relation to the other two bridges. The other two bridges were fairly flat, basic bridge types, and if this bridge was very high, it would look strange or unexpected.
- Commissioner Greenfield liked the modern-artistic bridge type, though the substructure might make it less desirable. Perhaps, it could have a superstructure to support the bridge the lower part with minimized. The bridge should be iconic in a subtle, elegant way, not in a glaringly monumental way. It should not be notably tall or have a spiral. The architectural treatment should not be added either.

Mr. Dupey summarized the comments and feedback from the Commissioners, noting there seemed to be support for including cost estimates and a basic bridge design as a choice, and there seemed to be general agreement for the project team to consider the three bridge types chosen by the public with consideration given to scale and height. (Slide 34)

- Commissioners seemed less excited about the Architectural bridge experience or form and the open form due to safety concerns. He understood the structural and semi-enclosed experiences had general support from the Commissioners. He invited further discussion about the bridge and plaza elements.

Comments regarding the bridge types and forms or experiences continued as follows (Slides 34):

- The architectural experience was not likely a structural part of the bridge.
- The Arching-simple was a structural design with support from above and minimal structure below that would be amenable to some kind of semi-enclosure to provide protection from the weather.
 - People would have walked or ridden in the rain before reaching the bridge, and if the Commission did not want people lingering on the bridge, why enclose it? It seemed contradicting.
- The spatial experience would be similar between Structural and Arching Simple; however when driving toward those designs, both would be iconic, not monumental. Structural and Cable-Cantilever had more lean support spires, so they were not as massive as Arching. All of the bridge types could be visually very elegant, and as a result iconic. Iconic meant a visual pattern that stayed in one's mind, where monumental regarded something grand and awe inspiring. Modern Artistic looked like an Antonio Gaudi type of bridge. Modern Artistic was harder to define. While that bridge type could be iconic, it was not as visually elegant. Perhaps, one's visual experience depended on whether you were on the bridge or driving towards it from either side.
- It might be good to wait to see the concept designs in the next phase, rather than discuss generalities.
- Arching Simple might be more expensive, so perhaps cost-saving measures could be identified as the project team went through these exercises, including any variables that added significant costs and then options for cost reductions could be considered.
- Mr. Dupey confirmed Staff had mentioned that Arching Simple could have other cost implications.
- The Semi-Enclosed and Architectural design pictures provoked a negative reaction, but not all designs under those headings would necessarily provoke that same reaction. While the idea of riding through a psychedelic spiral sounded kind of cool, it might be less fun in real life. The categories should not be discounted just because of the pictures presented.
- Mr. Dupey responded it was all in the design, the images presented generally addressed the form, which would be extracted to develop the concepts.

Mr. Dupey highlighted the bridge qualities (Slide 35), noting none were exclusive to a bridge type, but regarded design details moving forward. The Commission did not believe people would linger and did not support having seating on the bridge, although if there were views, seating in a specific location might be considered.

Additional comments on the bridge qualities were as follows:

- Having separated modes of travel was very important and a high priority with the public as well.
- Unique Lighting would add to the iconic nature at night. The Tilikum Bridge used iconic lighting that did not distract traffic.
- Mr. Weigel clarified that a 90% design stage meant that the project team was finishing up the minor details of the design before putting the project out to bid. The project would be almost ready to build.

Mr. Dupey stated the Commission supported all of the plaza qualities (Slide 36), particularly the plantings, some of which could be vertical to address issues with the plaza's scale. Town Center already had a great palette, so the team would build on those features, but making sure the plaza was a green, urban space with appropriate sound protection and places to sit and gather in a comfortable space.

Mr. Weigel reviewed the next steps, noting the project team would be presenting the same information to City Council next week, and using all the feedback received to develop the three bridge concepts as discussed. The team would also develop more outreach touch points through *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* and present the three concept designs to the community at the Community Block Party in August.

B. Town Center Streetscape Plan (Bradford)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, stated Staff was moving forward with an important implementation action from the Town Center Plan. The streetscape design plan was critical to implementing the actions related to the public realm. A number of infrastructure projects in Town Center would be integrated into the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP). Understanding the details of the streetscape and getting the public realm accurate was important, particularly along Main Street, but on the other supporting streets throughout Town Center as well. The City wanted to achieve the vision set forth in the Town Center Plan. As seen from the discussions on the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge, the bridge and the streetscape projects would be closely aligned. Both projects would talk about design elements and how the larger goals and vision of Town Center would play out during detailed discussions about what Town Center and those different design elements should look like. Tonight's presentation would inform the Commission about the project, and Staff welcomed discussion on the project scope and alignment with the pedestrian bridge project, as well as any other feedback.

The Planning Commission took a brief recess at 7:54 pm. The meeting reconvened at 7:59 pm.

Phillip Bradford, Associate Planner, introduced the Town Center Streetscape Plan via PowerPoint, reviewing the proposed public outreach, project timeline, and several examples of streetscape designs, which included sidewalk elements and street cross sections, as well as the three Town Center Plan street concepts.

Feedback and suggestions from the Planning Commission about the Streetscape Plan and design elements and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- Wayfinding signage would be integrated from the approved Signage and Wayfinding Plan to ensure a cohesive look throughout the entire City, though some small elements within that Plan could be used to identify specific neighborhoods.
 - For example, some street signs in Frog Pond had a little topper with the Frog Pond neighborhood information on it but it was consistent with the overall look identified in the citywide Signage and Wayfinding Plan. Any additional streetscape elements, such as landscaping treatments, flower pots, hanging baskets, or banner signs to identify the Town Center, would be done in a manner consistent with the adopted citywide Signage and Wayfinding Plan.
 - There could be scenarios where it might be desirable for elements of the Town Center to stretch toward the transit center, for example. While Town Center was generally cohesive and well-defined for those who understood where it was located, at some point, it made sense to have consistent branding, such as a sign topper, in the Town Center that was consistent with the rest of Wilsonville should the choice be made to extend the area towards transit center in the future.
- The Streetscape Plan would indicate the specific trees and plantings desired, but that would be finalized with the consultant. The City wanted to see very consistent planters, locations, and those different elements refined through the Plan so that any applicants would have clarity as to what would need to be constructed with regard to the public realm in Town Center.
- Now was the time to include any additional elements, such as bioswales, in the Streetscape Plan.
- Additional outreach regarding the Plan would occur through *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* and through the Community Block Party.
- Ms. Bateschell confirmed information from the Tree Survey completed a few years ago was available and would be utilized. She noted the survey involved City inventoried trees, and not all of the trees in Town Center were City inventoried. She believed part of this project included an inventory of the trees in Town Center which was not done during the Town Center Plan. There had been acknowledgement toward the end of the project that some trees were better than others from both a health perspective and the visibility provided for businesses. She confirmed the Tree Survey findings would be integrated into the discussion.
 - The Urban Forestry Management Plan was just getting off the ground and that project would have two study areas, one of which would be Town Center. That plan would encompass a lot of the work for the Streetscape Design Plan with regard to the tree inventory and specific recommendations for increasing

the urban forest using the Streetscape Design Plan and other implementation efforts within the Town Center. The Urban Forestry Management Plan would use the two case studies to create a template for the City to do that type of analysis in other areas of the city.

- With the exception of some trees in Frog Pond West and Villebois, not many existing trees in Town Center needed the Heritage or other tree protections, except for those within Town Center Park where the Heritage trees were part of an original concept for the area.
- The height and crown type of the vegetation and trees should also be considered, not only for the visibility of the store signage and windows, but also because of the pedestrian experience they would create in a walkable area like Town Center. The goal was a pedestrian-friendly environment, visually and experientially.
- It was difficult to know how the streetscape would look and feel without knowing what kind of buildings would be built along Town Center's avenues. The buildings would affect how pedestrians experience Main Street. The examples suggested some articulation between street and upper level structures, which was desired. The street-level facades would have the most impact on how pedestrians would feel in that neighborhood.
- Elements like big, colorful hanging baskets and holiday lighting were also important for creating a sense of place. Input on such items could be received through public outreach.
- Permeable pavers should be used to minimize the use of asphalt and concrete wherever possible, and the Town Center area provided a great opportunity to do so.
- As currently written, the scope of work intended to have the consultant work with Staff to consider appropriate locations to integrate public art into the project and Town Center in general.
- While a canopy was expected, lower level vegetation should also be considered to help manage stormwater. A combination of constructed and natural elements, including natural bioswales and greenery, should be used to address stormwater issue, especially along the Emerald Chain. The green elements would also help with noise mitigation and pollution management.
- The Commission had long discussions about outside seating areas when drafting the Town Center Plan. It would be beneficial for the consultant to consider private outside seating areas adjacent to the street when planning the street design. Did the Town Center Plan address having a harmonious design between the street and private outside seating areas?
 - Ms. Bateschell replied no design standards had been outlined yet. Staff had been looking at how the Streetscape Plan would be adopted to ensure that it built upon and was part of the Town Center Plan. While the Town Center Plan directed the streetscape design, the Streetscape Plan would add an additional layer of detail not originally in the Town Center Plan and would likely be adopted as an additional appendix via some type of amendment to become an official part of the Town Center Plan itself.
 - Consideration could be given to how any specific pavement treatments would tie into adjacent development. For example, the sidewalk treatment would be the expected materials to extend into seating areas, mini plazas, or community gathering areas, etc. adjacent to the street. Different materials could be required for different streets; however, Staff had not gotten to that layer of detail yet.
- There would be more discussion about when different projects or elements were constructed after getting into the TSP process. The installation order of the buildings, street lighting, etc. would depend on the specific project and whether the project was public or private and its funding structure. Some public projects might be constructed in advance of some development. Engineering would be able to provide information on how that process would play out.
 - Items such as lighting and trees could be dependent on a developer, but might be better done after development to ensure the survival of the trees, for example. On the other hand, having some of these elements done first could inspire the building architect to create a design that brought harmony to the area.
- While a menu of design elements was already included in the Town Center Plan, providing a palette along the lines of a Form-based Code was suggested to provide guidance for developers to draw on that would

result in a unified look consistent with the Streetscape Plan, even though development might happen piecemeal.

IV. INFORMATIONAL

- A. Equitable Housing Project Response to PC (No staff presentation)
- B. City Council Action Minutes (Feb. 3, 18 & 20, 2020) (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, clarified that the recent March City Council summary had not yet been prepared, but would be provided at the next Planning Commission meeting.

- C. 2020 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Commissioner Greenfield asked whether the Annual Housing Report could be integrated into the May Planning Commission meeting.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted a change in schedules in order to take items to City Council, leaving the sole agenda item for next month being the Annual Housing Report, which could be added to a future agenda. Staff are able to send the link to the report when it is ready so the Commissioners could look through the report in advance of a discussion at a later meeting. Some of the May agenda items might also move to the June agenda. The I-5 Pedestrian Bridge and Equitable Housing Strategic Plan were critical items, so Staff would try to keep those items on the agenda and see what could be done with the rest. She would confirm with the Planning Commission if the April meeting could be cancelled. She clarified that new Assistant Planner Georgia McAllister was the staff member working on the Annual Housing Report.

- She noted the Commissioners, as City volunteers, should have received a letter from City Manager Cosgrove conveying that the City was taking the coronavirus very seriously and that the safety and health of the City's volunteers was important to the City. The letter was sent to all City volunteers and provided information on what the City was doing and what each person as a resident and volunteer could do to take their own safety and health precautions. The City was taking direction from health authorities in the state and updates would be provided as things changed. If someone was not feeling well, they should feel free to stay home and options for calling in for a meeting would be considered, if necessary.
- She confirmed that four Planning Commissioners were needed for a quorum.

Commissioner Heberlein stated having the ability to call in was something he had wanted for a number of reasons, so he supported having that option.

Amanda Guile-Hinman noted that because Planning Commission meetings were televised some technological logistics had to be worked through, especially with the presentations, but it was something Staff was definitely being looked into, particularly if public meetings continued to be held.

Ms. Bateschell recognized Commissioner Springall for his years of service on both the Planning Commission and Development Review Board (DRB) and noted his involvement on the Frog Pond Task Force, French Prairie Bridge Task Force, and his many on the ground contributions in the community, including Friends of Trees, as he and his family had participated in almost, if not every, Arbor Day celebration, planting trees. She acknowledged his passion for the environment and ensuring that opportunities were provided to have a healthy and active community, as well as his advocacy for sustainable development, urban growth and environmentalism, and helping guide the Planning Commission's work in those ways.

Commissioner Springall thanked Ms. Bateschell for noticing the things he was passionate about, especially sustainability, noting he had been inspired by the New Partners Conference early on and he encouraged people continue going to the conference when possible. He thanked everyone, saying he had enjoyed being on the Planning Commission immensely, and that he had learned so much by working on the Planning Commission and

DRB, and talking with Staff. He appreciated being recognized for planting trees, adding he would miss Wilsonville, which was a great city.

Chair Mesbah and Commissioners Heberlein, Greenfield, and Millan briefly shared their appreciation and memories of Commissioner Springall. They recalled his passionate work during all his meetings, his work on the Bike and Pedestrian Bridge Task Force, his thought stimulating contributions, very useful, innovative ideas, and how he maintained focus through some very long and complex meetings. He did not back down from issues or positions he felt strongly about, even when the tide was turning against him. Everyone wished him well in his new endeavors.

Ms. Bateschell presented Commissioner Springall with a card and plaque. A cake reception followed.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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