



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2020

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Consideration of the January 8, 2020 PC Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2020
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Draft Minutes are to be
reviewed and approved
at the Feb. 12, 2020 PC
Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Ron Heberlein, Kamran Mesbah, Phyllis Millan, Simon Springall, 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 November 13, 2019 Planning Commission minutes
The November 13, 2019 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

B. Consideration of the December 11, 2019 Planning Commission minutes
The December 11, 2019 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

Agenda Items I.C and D were included on the revised agenda dated January 8, 2020.

C. Introduction of New Planning Commissioners – Willard and Woods
Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, welcomed newly appointed Planning Commissioners Jennifer Willard and Aaron Woods, both of whom had served as Development Review Board members.

Each of the Planning Commissioners introduced themselves, noting how long they had lived in Wilsonville and where, other City boards they had served on, and their areas of interest in serving on the Planning Commission.

D. Planning Commissioner Chair and Vice Chair Nominations
Amanda Guile-Hinman, Assistant City Attorney reviewed the rules and format for nominating and electing the Planning Commissioner Chair and Vice Chair.

Phyllis Millan nominated Kamran Mesbah for 2020 Planning Commission Chair.

Aaron Woods nominated Ron Heberlein for 2020 Planning Commission Chair.

Kamran Mesbah was elected as 2020 Planning Commission Chair by a 4 to 3 vote with Commissioners Springall, Heberlein, Greenfield, and Willard voting for Kamran Mesbah and Commissioners Millan, Mesbah, and Woods voting for Ron Heberlein.

Simon Springall nominated Ron Heberlein as 2020 Planning Commission Vice Chair.

Kamran Mesbah nominated Aaron Woods as 2020 Planning Commission Vice Chair.

Ron Heberlein was elected as 2020 Planning Commission Vice Chair by a 5 to 2 vote with Commissioners Springall, Greenfield, Millan, Woods, and Willard voting for Ron Heberlein and Commissioners Mesbah and Heberlein voting for Aaron Woods.

Commissioner Greenfield passed the gavel to newly elected Planning Commission Chair Kamran Mesbah.

II. WORK SESSION

A. Commercial Recreation In Planned Industrial Development Zones – White Paper (Bradford)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, introduced Associate Planner Philip Bradford, who had joined the City in October from Columbus, Ohio and brought a mix of both private and public sector planning experience to the team. Tonight, he would present a new topic that came about as a research question from City Council and because of questions Staff had received over the years from people interested in putting Commercial Recreation uses in Wilsonville's PDI Zone. The City commissioned a research paper, conducted by Angelo Planning Group, to look at what other cities in the region were doing with regard to Commercial Recreation, and also to get feedback from the Planning Commission on policy questions.

Philip Bradford presented the Commercial Recreation in Planned Industrial Development (PDI) Zone via PowerPoint, noting that in response to community inquiries on the use, City Council had directed the Planning Department to research the expansion of allowing those uses in the PDI Zone. The uses were typically things like indoor sports facilities such as, gymnastics studios, CrossFit gyms, and dance studios, which generally preferred to locate in spaces with large floor areas and high ceilings that tend to be located in industrial-type structures.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission was as follows with responses by Staff to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Staff confirmed feedback from the Commission was being sought on the white paper and particularly, the policy questions (Slide 10) regarding Commercial Recreation. The white paper was included in the packet beginning on Page 4 of 15 (Attachment 1) following the Staff report. Staff was not aware of any direct study pertaining to the proposed aquatic center.
- There had been some consideration of the proposal prior to it being added to the ballot in order to gauge public interest. Having such a background study was new territory with regard to City Code. Sites were considered, but there had not been any discussion about how those sites fit with City Code.
 - Staff understood the sites considered for the aquatic center were zoned PDC or Commercial, which differed from tonight's discussion in that the Commission was considering the extent to have Commercial Recreation in the PDI Zone, specifically.
- Staff clarified the issue was that the PDI Zone limited a gym in a single-structure building to 5,000 sq ft, and ~~to~~ 20,000 sq ft in a multiple structure development, which also took into consideration any other retail or Commercial use located within that development. The white paper showed the average size of the type of use being discussed was 15,000 sq ft and above, so existing uses within the City looking to expand even a small amount found themselves constrained by the existing square footage limits.
 - In 2004, the City changed the standards based on Metro's Title 4 to decrease the amount of Commercial use. Before 2004, the standard was that 20% of a site could be Commercial use in the PDI Zone. While the 2004 change significantly reduced that allowance, quite a bit of development prior to that change grandfathered in the existing businesses, such as the CrossFit in the Canyon Creek Business Park. Not many spaces were available that still fell into the old grandfathered allowance in the master plans.
 - In the case of Wilsonville Road Business Park, there was some lack of clarity after the 2004 change as to whether the 20,000 sq ft allowance for a multi-building development could be grouped in one

building, or whether it was limited to 5,000 sq ft per building. The issue had since been clarified through a Planning Director's interpretation that some flexibility existed to put 20,000 sq ft in one building.

- In the current market, there was also a lack of these sites. Jewart's indicated they were looking for a larger space, but were unable to locate one yet in Wilsonville. Staff had received inquiries for a wide variety of uses, including indoor sports courts and indoor sports fields, which were unable to find a space that met their needs in Wilsonville.
- Staff clarified that a higher intensity of use would have more users at that facility or a larger size, making impacts greater for parking or traffic, which were elements to be carefully considered.
 - The white paper found that other jurisdictions made a distinction between indoor or outdoor facilities. The intention was to make sure the City was taking in a bigger picture of what other jurisdictions were doing, in order to determine whether that same distinction should be made in Wilsonville.
 - Outdoor recreation examples included tennis courts, swimming pools, racquetball courts, mini golf, or batting cages.
- While there was a need, the intent of the PDI Zone in general, which was to encourage employment, must also be considered. While room existed to allow for limited Commercial Recreation uses in some industrial zones, a balance of employment and residential facilities in the city, as well as public spaces and appropriate Commercial uses, should be encouraged, as long as care was taken not to over allow the Commercial uses and destroy the city's potential industrial land.
- Expanding the Code to allow some Commercial use and limiting it to preserve the PDI's intent seemed sensible. The facilities near an employment area were very attractive to large employers and those trying to recruit the best talent want to be able to offer a rich, vibrant community for those employees to go to work in.
- In response to a question about the relevant zoning for Edge Family Fitness, which was associated with a residential apartment complex, Staff indicated the parcel was in a mixed zone and zoned Planned Development Commercial (PDC). The specific square footage of the fitness facility was not available.
 - Anytime Fitness was a smaller facility in the Fred Meyer shopping center, which was zoned Commercial.
- The proposed standards in Attachment 1 discussed setting a limit on trip generation and also around parking. A traffic study had already been done in the planned industrial areas prior to any development, so that information should remain in any new standards that were created as long as the traffic flow specified for that particular street was not exceeded. Language could be drafted as far as not limiting the trips already allowed, or the applicant could pay for a new traffic study to show that the traffic could be accommodated. Parking would have to be addressed by each individual applicant.
 - Some of the criteria Staff outlined were very good, and setting some guidelines was reasonable. There was a need for this change and there were a lot of industrial zones, not all completely full. If this would help bring employment to the area, although not the type of employment envisioned when creating the PDI Zone, the zoning change should move forward.
- Mr. Pauly explained that by reducing the maximum square footage that could be used, Metro was trying to preserve employment lands for employment, and in doing so, Metro clarified that having uses that support employment and provide amenities for employment made sense, so having some mix of Commercial in the employment areas was appropriate. Different standards were set for general employment industrial areas versus Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (RSIA).
- As long as the change did not dilute and actually helped the efficacy of the land use, it would create a more harmonious use in the area, as opposed to someone deciding it was a recreational use and the City would be flexible.
- Some uses, like mini-golf, were not "middle of the day" uses, as opposed to things that would bring more traffic or be used by the existing residents or workers in that area, which would reduce the traffic. The idea of traffic impact would need to be finely honed to determine where the facilities were drawing from.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted that Metro Title 4 addressed the pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) for employment lands due to shortages of employment land in the region and especially shortages of

large lot industrial. At that time, the Metro Council had gone through previous iterations of UGB adjustments, and some of the previous land brought in for employment uses at that time was being constructed with large commercial users, such as Home Depot, Lowe's, and other large big box retail users. Much of the pressure put on Metro to expand the UGB was for employment. Service employment was one version of employment, but there was also a desire from regional players to also protect employment uses for industrial and manufacturing, which often had a bit lower return on investment, especially in the near term, and not just Commercial retail users or Commercial development.

- Title 4 included different designations: RSIA, industrial areas, and employment areas. Not every industrially zoned property was designated on Metro's Title 4 map; only certain industrial lands in the region appeared on the map.
- In the deployment of Title 4, most of the regulations revolve around parcelization, so that a large industrial lot that was brought into the UGB would remain a large industrial lot for development and could not be subdivided or partitioned. The idea behind the limits was that it was supporting Commercial and Retail uses that support the employment district as well as nearby industrial users.
- Because the City of Wilsonville had only two industrial zones, PDI and PDI-RSIA, the size limitations were included, and while a significant portion of the PDI land was Title 4, not all of it was. The Title 4 map would need reviewed to determine which PDI Zones were not on the map. The size limitation applied because it was adopted into the City of Wilsonville Code for all of the PDI Zones.
- A time shift often occurred with these facilities in industrial zones with regard to traffic because the facilities might not always be used 9 am to 5 pm. Parking and traffic issues might be lessened because the use often took place on evenings and weekends, which was something to consider in the Code or to reflect in the permitting process to ensure consistency for future uses of the same property.
- When developing the Town Center Plan, there was discussion about multiple land uses being located together and how time shifts might not result in parking issues. Increasing foot traffic was a goal, and it also made sense in employment centers, as discussed with Coffee Creek to provide a strong work environment that allowed people to move about more freely at lunch time, for instance, without having to drive across town and add to the already congested traffic.

Vice Chair Heberlein:

- Requested additional data for the next meeting, such as how much of the City's industrial land was in Title 4, and how much PDI land was grandfathered into the 20% allowance, which would help him understand if this was a real or a perceived problem. In the existing rules, how much square footage was currently being used in the PDI land for Commercial uses? Knowing that percentage would help him understand the impact of that current limit.
- Confirmed with Staff that the square footage limitation applied to all Commercial, not just Commercial Recreational. He noted that to help with the context, it would be helpful to know the total square footage of the in the Wilsonville Road Business Park, for example, the current Commercial square footage in that business park, and why Jewart's expansion would be an issue, such as because the allowed capacity had already been exceeded.
 - Ms. Bateschell believed Basalt Creek was currently only industrial and not RSIA, extending the allowance into Basalt Creek could be discussed. No zoning had been applied to Basalt Creek yet, but if Basalt Creek were zoned PDI, then whatever was done during this process would take effect in that area as well. Coffee Creek was RSIA, and this zone change would not apply in the RSIA areas.
- Added he would also like to see information on whether any traffic issues related to the existing facilities currently existed, such as access and parking problems, and where those issues were occurring so that any future problems might be mitigated in the Code moving forward.

Commissioner Springall noted that a time shift was often experienced with these facilities in industrial zones with regard to traffic in these areas, as the facilities might not always be used 9 am to 5 pm. Parking and

traffic issues might be lessened because the use often took place on evenings and weekends, which was something to consider in the Code.

Chair Mesbah added or reflected in the permitting process to ensure consistency for future uses of the same property.

Commissioner Springall noted that when developing the Town Center Plan, there was discussion about multiple uses of land in order to provide for foot traffic, parking and potential traffic flows in areas where retail, industrial and residential areas were located together. There was also discussion about foot traffic in Coffee Creek with regard to providing a strong work environment that allowed people to move about more freely without having to travel across town and add to already busy traffic areas.

B. Residential Zoning Standards Modernization Project (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted this was the fifth work session on the highly technical Residential Zoning Standards Project. With the goal of improving the Code to be more clear and objective, the work involved going step-by-step through the inconsistencies in the Code, and providing clarity in certain areas. Over the last couple months, Staff had conducted some outreach, particularly to the development community, which Mr. Pauly would present along with some additional refinements Staff recommended based on that input for the Planning Commission's consideration. Tonight, the hope was to receive a final recommendation from the Commission on the proposed language and amendments, which would be noticed and returned to the Commission for a hearing in March.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, presented the Residential Zoning Standards Modernization Project via PowerPoint, reviewing the changes made since the standards were last discussed in October, the results from the outreach survey done in November and December, and the recommended actions going forward. He also reviewed the rationale for removing two previously presented changes (Slides 14 & 15) and two additional changes Staff proposed (Slides 17 & 18) about which Staff requested the Commission's feedback.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission and responses by Staff to Commissioner questions was as follows:

- The new Commissioners were asked if these issues had come up while they were involved on the DRB, especially in the Frog Pond area because the PDR was the newest code, and many of the proposed changes were made based, in part, on what was done in the Frog Pond code, especially with regard to the open space, which differed from the older areas of Wilsonville.
 - Commissioner Woods commented that he did not remember coming across any issues while on DRB.
 - Commissioner Willard recalled being on the DRB panel for a Frog Pond review, but she did not remember any waiver requirements or exceptions taken to the standard policies that were applied.
- Staff confirmed the example in Section 4.124.A on Page 61 of 73 would be updated to reflect the correct minimum lot size of 2,000 sq ft and that the information in Table 2 was correct.
- Section 4.124.A on Page 61 of 73 also showed "a minimum of 1 for subdivision into 4 lots". Should it be "a maximum of 1"?
 - Staff clarified that if a partial number was rounded up, the amount would exceed the 20% maximum adjustment allowed, therefore the figure must be rounded down to avoid exceeding the 20% maximum.
 - Because 20% of four lots either had to round up to 1 or go down to 0, "a minimum of 1" was used, not "a maximum of 1". The key was to think about the edges, because issues tend to arise in the margins. If there were 4 lots and an adjustment was needed, 1 lot could be adjusted, even though it was more than 20% of the lots. Three lots would not be a subdivision, so different standards would apply and there would be no open space requirement.
- Commissioner Greenfield commended Mr. Pauly for doing such a remarkably well done work-up; drawing out each of the relevant items and thoroughly describing the rationale for the changes, along with the options for moving forward.

- Given that response to the community outreach survey was relatively low, did Staff believe adequate information or responses were received or was additional information needed.
 - Mr. Pauly stated he was pleased with the variety of perspectives and ideas in the four completed responses, and the additional 21 comment would be helpful in further refining the Code changes. Because so much residential outreach had been done recently as part of the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan (EHSP) and the Frog Pond Residential Zoning, Staff had a good handle on what the community's viewpoints around this project. There had been discussions over the years with developers and neighbors about these smaller properties and the issues with developing them. Of course, any additional comments were welcome due to the complexity of the issues. With the variety of experience and perspectives of the Commissioners, especially of those who were former DRB members, as well as Staff, the City was getting different viewpoints, he had a good comfort level professionally.
- No open house was done and none was currently planned because it was unlikely that much participation or input would be garnered on such a technical topic. Perhaps Staff could be available to address questions and concerns, because the printed information and charts could be confusing to some people.
- With only four people answering the survey, the outreach did not meet any test of statistical validity and, at best, was mostly anecdotal, on which decisions should not be based.
 - Mr. Pauly stated the most useful part of the survey was the comments received from different perspectives that would be helpful to continue considering as the changes were refined. Additionally, all of the work that went into the Frog Pond Plan created a modern code, and there was validity about using that as a template for updating other components of the code because that process encompassed so many different community perspectives and different versions of codes, including model codes, the City has had in the past.
- Even without a large public response, the process had been valuable in how it laid out and clarified the issues and pertinent factors so well.
 - Mr. Pauly noted no one was in audience, but Staff could reach out to the 61 people invited to take the survey to see if they had comments or were interested in a listening session for further explanation, if the Commission felt that would be valuable. It would be more optimal than having 40 people bring questions and concerns to the public hearing in March.
- One previous change Staff recommended for removal concerned having the same standards for the same lot size regardless of the zone. (Slide 14) Discussion was as follows:
 - On DRB, Staff's recommendations held considerable weight. Could Staff use their expertise in areas that had some ambiguity to make a recommendation based on that very specific application and scenario, versus having it firmly written in the Code?
 - Mr. Pauly replied it would be difficult to tell a developer that while code stated one thing, the developer had to meet the lower standard due to a big lot size. Developers typically want maximum lot coverage. A developer would take issue with the idea that a house to be constructed on a 6,000 sq ft lot could only be two-thirds its size. The developer would want what the code stated. (Slide 14)
 - Any ambiguity did not necessarily benefit the developer, but if a standard could be understood it was pretty clear, with the proposed removal, it would be clear that the lot coverage for a property in the PDR-5 Zone was as stated in Code, regardless of the lot size, which would remove any ambiguity.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted that regional and State policies, as well as Oregon Housing policies, require the City to have clear and objective standards for housing. If Code allowed Planning Staff to make determinations in certain conditions that would not be considered a clear and objective standard, so it did need to be called out one way or the other in the Code.
 - Commissioner Woods believed there should be no ambiguity in the Code and that removing the change would make the Code more clear.
- The second previous change Staff recommended for removal concerned the outright allowance to count nearby public parks toward meeting open space requirements (Slide 15) Discussion was as follows:
 - The Commission had discussed the function of open spaces, so a 1/4-mile walking distance via a trail or sidewalk was suggested so the functionality of being able to walk to the park existed as opposed to

having to cross I-5. However, if that could be achieved through a waiver, it would serve the same purpose. (Slide 15)

- The Commission had been looking to balance the functionality of the access to open space with the concern that different lot sizes might have different levels of use and access to common open space. In view of the information presented, it made sense to go with the simpler solution and default to the waiver process if a developer wanted to claim that an adjacent park provided appropriate open space, especially with the rider that was included, stating, “if it was not used to meet open space use for another development”, which would be very difficult to determine. Because that was not measurable, it would be simpler to remove it. (Slide 15)
- Because the ¼ mile criteria raised issues, it should be removed.
- Another discussion had regarded other aspects of the functionality issue, which was equity and inclusivity. If another neighborhood's facility was going to be used, it might not be as inviting, equitable, or inclusive of the kids in adjacent developments who did not have the same demographics/characteristics being potentially created in the various development projects.

The Commission agreed to remove the previously presented changes shown on Slides 14 and 15. Additional discussion continued as follows:

- The first additional change added a definition for Buildable Gross Area [Gross Buildable Area; shown both ways]. (Slide17)
 - Staff explained Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) were specifically identified because other easements were more flexible and could change over time. BPA rarely allowed changes, while PGE easements could be rerouted or put underground. PGE easements were generally narrower, about 10 ft to 20 ft wide, while BPA easements were large swaths of land.
 - Because names were subject to change, not specifically identifying BPA might be a good idea to avoid issues in the future.
 - If ‘high-voltage powerline easements’ was used, the term ‘high-voltage’ would need to be defined.
 - Mr. Pauly noted the current proposed language acknowledged the nature of how Gross Buildable Area exists on the ground. He suggested, “Bonneville Power Administration **or successor**”. The size and permanence of the BPA easements, and the fact that they impact many residential areas around the city, led them to be considered differently from other easements.
 - Vice Chair Heberlein confirmed including 'or successor' was acceptable.
- The second additional change was to include language to clarify who determines the feasibility of meeting minimum density requirements to justify an adjustment. (Slide18) The waiver process was not clear and objective; however, in cases where simple adjustments were needed due to unique circumstances, the goal was to create a clear and objective path for developers to follow through the lot size adjustment process.
- Canyon Creek Park Subdivision would be a good case study because of the powerline easement, access problems, and SROZ involved. How it would have been approved today was uncertain.
 - Mr. Pauly said he would look back at the case history and share whether the Canyon Creek Subdivision would work under the existing standards and how it might work with the newly proposed amendments.
 - Commissioner Springall commented that he used to live in Canyon Creek, adding that while on the DRB, he discovered that while it was a residential development, it was zoned industrial.
- Mr. Pauly clarified the proposed language would be inserted prior to the last sentence in Section 4.124.(.08) on Page 60 of 73. “...plus any SROZ density transfer pursuant to ~~Subsection 4.139.11(.02)~~ **The applicant’s demonstration of a conflict shall include analysis of at least 3 alternative subdivision layouts and clear identification of the atypical characteristics of the site and conflicting standards.** Adjustments to...” (Slide 18) Staff sought feedback on whether the existing language was clear and objective enough or if the additional language was necessary.

- Concerns were expressed about applicants stating the requirement to provide 3 alternative layouts was too onerous, and that it required them to prove a known hypothesis, when a 4th proposal could be submitted that disproved that theory.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed that the City was actually requiring the applicant to do their due diligence in attempting to figure out a solution.
 - Creating such layouts, like those in Frog Pond, often involved landscape architects because it was an art, involving more than the math, but orienting the lots for marketability and so forth. Typically, a developer interested in developing a small 5-acre parcel, for example, would most likely be drawing their ideas out by hand or on the computer.
- Vice Chair Heberlein suggested it might be simpler to state, ***“The applicant’s demonstration of a conflict shall include analysis of at least 3 alternative subdivision layouts and clear identification of the atypical characteristics of the site and conflicting standards.”***
 - The word ‘clear’ was ambiguous and subjective. If the City wanted the applicant’s due diligence, was the identification of atypical characteristics and conflicting standards enough to satisfy that threshold?
- An applicant coming up with 3 alternatives did not necessarily demonstrate due diligence, since an applicant could come up with 3 spurious plans without a goal to solve the problem because the applicant already knew what they wanted.
- Mr. Pauly proposed the language as follows, “...plus any SROZ density transfer pursuant to ~~Subsection 4.139.11 (.02)~~ ***the demonstration shall include identification of the atypical characteristics of the site and conflicting standards.*** Adjustments to...”
- Concern was expressed about using ‘characteristics’ since it could be subjective. An applicant could state, “It does not give me the Feng Shui I want.” If Staff wanted to ensure the dimensions were correct, ‘physical characteristics’ should be used, or perhaps, problematic physical characteristics of the site.
- A definition of ‘atypical’ in this context should be added.
 - Mr. Pauly replied he avoided using the word unique, which had specific meaning in the Development Code as it related to variance. However, because the word unique was consistently found throughout the Development Code, especially in situations where variances or not following the rules exactly was involved, so “unique physical characteristics of the site” would be better.
 - He clarified that at this point, the emphasis was on determining the size, rather than the design of the open space. Unique physical characteristics in this case would be difficulties that come from the width of a right-of-way or issues related to achieving the minimum density or the minimum lot size that did not leave enough room for open space.
- Mr. Pauly clarified the issue regarded the consumption of land area, open space would still be required, but this language would determine the amount of open space. The criteria for professional design for aesthetics, accessibility, and minimum size would not change with the adjustment process.
- The proposed language would provide a developer some defined ways to reconfigure the site to make the layout work in a way to still have a parcel with useable open space as required.

Ms. Bateschell proposed that Staff work with legal staff to refine the language to address the issues raised, remove some of the subjective wording, and ensure it tied in very closely to the standards that conflict with one another, and how that resulted in the proposed changes. Staff would bring the revised language back to the Commission at the public hearing.

Mr. Pauly confirmed that with the 10% open space allowance, the 6,000 sq ft lot or larger was driven by the threshold between a medium lot and small lot in Frog Pond. If lots were less than 6,000 sq ft, the open space requirement was 10%.

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. I-5 Pedestrian Bridge

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, updated that Staff had begun work with the consultant and was working on plans for community outreach, including the open house scheduled for Wednesday, February 19th at City Hall, most likely in the evening. There would be information on the project, and the opportunity to provide input. A *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* page had been created for the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge project, but Staff had not solicited any input yet. A survey would be posted during the month of February.

- Although the open house would be competing with the Democratic Debate, February 19th was the best option, given the number of City and Citizen's Academy meetings scheduled in the Council Chambers.
- She confirmed the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge Open House would involve the entire design, including the landings on both sides. The only change from the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) was that the design of the public plaza located at the east side landing in Town Center would be done in conjunction with the design of the bridge to ensure cohesiveness and construction of the bridge, landing, and plaza at the same time.
 - The Town Center logo was being used with the pedestrian bridge header to keep the consistency in branding as seen through the Town Center project. The Town Center outlets would also be utilized to push information about the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge project since the City already had a lot of interested parties regarding the Town Center site.
 - Mr. Weigel did a good job of outlining the components of the public engagement, which were still being refined with the consultant team.
 - Major milestone components included the kick-off open house in February with another push in the April/May timeframe to solidify the bridge type and landings to help move into 30% design. Another community engagement push would take place at the City Block Party in August, where the community would be asked about more refined details concerning specific elements within the public plaza and open space, as well as preferred designs for lighting, landscaping, and various elements, and whether any themes should be used.
 - Funding for the project was provided from Metro's Regional Flexible Funds.

Commissioner Millan noted a lot of work had been put into the wayfinding signage with a lot of good public input in terms of thematic ideas. Consideration should be given about including some of those ideas into the bridge and plaza.

- Ms. Bateschell replied the Wayfinding and Signage Master Plan and all of the appendices regarding the background work done with the community about the themes, the feel of the community, and what designs resonated with them. The consultant team that managed the Town Center Plan was running the public engagement component for the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge project and was also a landscape architect on the plaza design.
 - What had been gained through community outreach over the past 2 to 2½ years on those two projects would be used as a starting point to guide what would be presented at the open house with regard to themes and confirming the ideas that had been heard so far. Visual preference surveys would be included to confirm that what had resonated with the community previously continued to resonate.

B. City Council Action Minutes (Dec. 2 & 16, 2019) (No staff presentation)

There were no questions or comments.

C. 2020 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted Staff still planned to discuss the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan in February.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, stated he was waiting for confirmation from the State on the grant for the Wilsonville Housing Variety Plan, so he was uncertain whether it would be discussed in February.

Chair Mesbah noted the Equitable Housing Task Force would meet at the end of the month.

Commissioner Springall announced he would be moving to Ireland in April, but he would be happy to stay on the Commission until that time. He enjoyed working with the Commission and was glad that he could follow through with the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, even though he could not for the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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