



Draft PC Minutes were reviewed and approved at the September 14, 2022 PC Meeting.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

August 10, 2022 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission was held at City Hall beginning at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 10, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Aaron Woods, Andrew Karr, Kamran Mesbah, Olive Gallagher, and Breanne Tusinski. Jennifer Willard was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Dwight Brashear, Eric Loomis, Kelsey Lewis, Mandi Simmons.

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

1. Consideration of the July 13, 2022, Planning Commission Minutes

Consideration of the July 13, 2022, Planning Commission Minutes was postponed to the Commission's September meeting.

WORK SESSION

2. Transit Master Plan (Lewis)

Kelsey Lewis, SMART Grants and Programs Manager, introduced the Transit Master Plan (TMP) update noting SMART Transit Director Dwight Brashear and Transit Operations Manager Eric Loomis were present via Zoom for questions.

Michelle Poyourow noted she was involved in the TMP in 2016 and was honored to come before the Planning Commission again. She presented the progress on the TMP update via PowerPoint, introducing the project team members from Jarrett Walker + Associates, enviroissues, who were leading the public engagement, and from Parametrix, who would assist with transit operations advice,

capital planning, and fleet planning once a transit network and service plan was drafted. She briefly described the purpose of the TMP update, the changes since the last update in 2017, and the general project timeline, noting the progress made so far and anticipated milestones of the update with completion expected in Spring/Summer 2023.

Brenda Martin, Public Involvement Specialist, enviroissues, continued the PowerPoint presentation, highlighting events and tools during the first phase of public engagement occurring through October and describing the public survey and stakeholder workshops planned in August and September. Her key additional comments were as follows:

- The public survey scheduled to begin this Friday, August 12th would be administered online via the 'Let's Talk Wilsonville' SMART page for the TMP as well as on board buses to solicit bus riders' participation. (Slide 7) SMART Staff had been attending farmers markets and community events throughout the city this summer to let the public know about the TMP update and would continue to do so until the end of the survey on September 12, 2022. (Slide 7)
 - While much of the information being sought from the survey was available from data over the last couple of years, much of it had changed due to the pandemic.
- An intensive, half-day workshop would be held in early September for stakeholders with a vested interest in the TMP, such as those representing agencies or key organization/community groups that tended to be more transit-dependent or had trouble connecting to transit currently. The workshop would focus on gaining a better understanding about the tradeoffs between local versus regional service, and the priorities regarding where SMART could better serve the residents and visitors of Wilsonville. Enviroissues had created a list of stakeholders to invite to the September workshop and sought the Planning Commission's input about any additional stakeholders to invite to September's workshop. (Slide 9)

Comments and suggestions from the Commission were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Additional stakeholders suggested by the Commission included homeowner associations (HOAs), minority groups, and more focus on youth representation.
 - Enviroissues could contact the City's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Commission for specific suggestions on how to reach different ethnic groups in the city.
 - **Ms. Martin** assured the team would work to ensure all stakeholder groups included a diverse representation at the workshop.
 - With two or three physical therapy clinics in the area, as well as Providence Medical Center, those who are injured for a period of time and unable to transport themselves could be an underserved population who did not realize the transit options available when unable to drive themselves.
 - Many people in younger generations, such as older high school students and college students, were looking to test the limits of their freedom and reduce their carbon footprint.
 - The youth were the future of transit and the future of the city, and it was important that the City was really listening to those who would be using the system for the longest period of time.
- 'Stakeholder' typically meant those who use the transit system, but those who did not use the system may emerge from the survey. Having follow-up conversations with non-riders was suggested to understand why they did not use the system, whether any were potential users, and what the impediments were to ridership.

- **Ms. Martin** noted a few survey questions asked how often the respondent had taken SMART over the last year, and if they had not ridden or had never used SMART, they were asked for their reasons and allowed to choose as many as applied. Those results would be interesting and could help the consultants do some follow-up. Those non-users were not the stakeholders usually thought of, but they were the people SMART was trying to convince to use transit.
- **Ms. Martin** clarified the survey had been translated into Spanish, and she believed the page could be translated via Google, which the team would research.
- Understanding the goal would better inform what stakeholders to suggest. If the goal was to achieve an X increase in ridership that would involve a different set of stakeholders. If the goal was to maintain the existing ridership base, then that was a different set of stakeholders. Knowing what was trying to be achieved would make it easier to develop a list of stakeholders.
 - **Ms. Martin** believed the existing summary included a list of goals for the TMP.
 - **Ms. Poyourow** noted the stakeholder workshop would address questions of priority and policy for the future TMP. Stakeholders were not just people who might themselves want to ride the bus, but also people whose opinions should be considered about how Wilsonville grows, how transit changes in Wilsonville, and what would be most important as the City developed its transit system over the next five years. The stakeholders were people with lots of different perspectives on the city, the life and growth of the city, as well as people interested in transit. The existing stakeholder list included a very specific portion of the community, so homeowners would be a good addition to the stakeholder group.

3. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, presented the updates to the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan via PowerPoint, providing information requested from the Commission, which included a brief overview of Villebois' housing mix, highlighting the design concepts discussed in February, and presenting the residential polices for housing variety. Staff sought input on several elements related to the criteria for Components 1 and 2, which involved target housing types and a cap on single housing types, respectively.

- Component 1. (Slides 7-8) Staff had some initial ideas about target housing types and the criteria to use. (Slide 8) He noted defining the mix of uses would not define any specific price point, but would look at the mix that would give the best opportunity to serve different market segments.
 - Targeting housing types identified in the Affordable Housing Analysis would serve the market rate segment of 80 to 120 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI).
 - Other ideas included accessory dwelling units (ADU) and cottages. ADUs could help with affordability as well as meet certain demographic segments of the market not otherwise served by larger homes.
 - Accessible living options were another idea, particularly smaller, accessible, single-floor options; however, these options would further analysis by the project team.
- As discussed during July's work session, some housing varieties would not likely be built by the market through incentive so a requirement would make more sense. However, the City may be able to incentivize some housing types, such as ADUs.
- Staff sought feedback on identifying the target housing types, how much of each housing type should be required and what to require versus incentivize.

The Commissioner comments and feedback regarding Component 1 Criteria was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Different housing products could be placed within all three housing types, so with the 80% to 120% AMI goal and knowing Frog Pond West was built out with larger houses, East and South would need a mix of townhouses, condos, and smaller, detached single family homes.
 - Commissioner Karr suggested Type 1 could be a mixture of 4-unit townhouses, multi-story condos, and detached single-family with 20 percent minimums and 30 percent maximums of each type. Type 2 could be a mix of three-unit townhouses and detached single-family homes, both with 30 percent minimums and 50 percent maximums, for a kind of 50/50 split. Type 3 could be four- and two-unit townhouses mixed at 50 percent and detached single-family homes at 50 percent. He agreed to email Mr. Pauly those numbers, which could be passed on to the other Commissioners.
- **Mr. Pauly** confirmed that a zoning scheme could be developed that offered a minimum requirement of a housing type and incentives for exceeding the minimum percentage.
- The City should do everything possible to have a standard minimum and then incentivize, which would work with other design preferences. Although how to provide a target mix for a balanced approach was unclear at this time, providing housing types with no numbers was a problem. It was important that the City not paint itself into a corner and make it impossible to meet not only incentives but the market situation. Thus far, the Commission had worked on the premise of keeping flexibility while also including minimum targets to avoid missing the opportunities for achieving the upward mobility and housing mix desired. The markets analysis was very helpful but coming up with a design and policy that allowed flexibility for Staff and those rendering approval to find the best and most doable mix at the time was difficult. Having draft policy language to frame the issue would enable Commissioners to give provide better feedback.
 - **Mr. Pauly** noted Staff could explore ways to update the regulated mix in a couple years after the City completed the Housing Needs Analysis and had a new production strategy.
 - Hopefully, that was not needed. The hope was to have aspirational language that tells decision makers, whenever decisions were made, what the target vision is and allow them to hone that to the conditions and opportunities at the time. Maybe that was not doable, and something would need to be set up now, and then revisited in two to three years.
- The City was looking at market affordability of 80 to 120 percent. Was there a reason 60 to 80 percent was not considered?
 - **Mr. Pauly** replied 60 to 80 percent would not be delivered by market rate housing and would need to be some sort of subsidized-type project which, in terms of types, would still be allowed but would be separate from the Master Plan. Language would likely exempt subsidized, affordable housing from any variety requirements. If funding came into place, partnerships were made, and an affordable developer built something, that would be outside this Master Plan. The City could not require a certain amount of 60 to 80 percent, and it was likely no products could be developed at that price point without being subsidized somehow.
 - Information was available in the Affordable Housing Analysis, but tiny homes would likely be in the 80 to 120 percent category. While tiny homes would meet a different kind of market need demographic than other products, they would still be fairly expensive due to the fixed cost of building the infrastructure and installing kitchen and bathroom fixtures.

- He confirmed cottages referred to cottage clusters (Slide 8) and confirmed Staff would double check to see if the cost of cottages or tiny homes could meet the below 80 percent market segment, and if so, the City may want to include them in the target housing types.
- Staff was encouraged to look into the affordability of tiny homes and cottages more closely, and Commissioner Woods offered to send more information if needed. For affordability purposes and considering first-time homeowners, the City should seriously consider tiny homes while ensuring the tiny homes fit with the models in the particular subareas.
- The City should consider a certain percentage of accessible, one-level homes that could meet the needs of seniors or those looking to move from a two-story to a one-story home.
- As far as requiring versus incentivizing, incentivizing was preferred. Certainly, the City did need to require a certain percentage, but determining those percentages was a struggle given all the other variables being discussed. Perhaps **Commissioner Karr's** information would help.
- It was important for the City to pay attention to the extreme changes happening in the country, the climate, and in the world, and serving the needs of the future population rather than the known quantity in the present. Concern was expressed about the City making decisions about percentages of housing types based on what was known right now, when the question was what kind of community would Wilsonville be 20 years from now? What kind of population was the City trying to attract? What kind of businesses? Would the City be able to provide housing to the population working in those businesses?
 - That was why flexibility was needed.
- Regarding comments about the affordability of cottages and tiny houses, the City's focus in Frog Pond was as it should be. The Commission had already discussed that a greenfield development could not effectively produce affordability. The graphs on Page 20 of Attachment 1 indicated where the housing shortfall was in the city, which was drastic, as well as the closing housing target the City could meet for the Frog Pond neighborhood, which was on the edge of the city. The Planning Commission had discussed how having public funding available for housing would make things different, at least in other parts of the city, so the City could have housing availability for lower percentages of median income. Had City Council discussed that topic or was the Council still where it was three years ago prior to the housing strategy? Was the City getting any closer to at least looking down the road at the potential of having housing services?
 - **Mr. Pauly** confirmed that was in process, but there was certainly more work to do. Council was looking at the TOD transit project to provide some immediate affordable housing. Matt Lorenzen recently worked on the vertical housing tax credit which could be used both in Town Center and Villebois, and potentially even in the Frog Pond commercial area, if the developer wanted to do vertical mixed use. In addition, the Urban Renewal Task force recently had a meeting about exploring how urban renewal could come into play and considered a system similar to the Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Program, where spot-specific additions were made to the Urban Renewal District in order to take advantage of help from tax increment financing to assist with affordable housing. All these options were being proactively looked at right now, and there was a lot more to do. City Council realized affordability was an ongoing conversation but was interested in the topic.
- Staff's comments were helpful. The timeline for any discussions to start creating options for affordable housing was probably about the same as the development of the Frog Pond neighborhood. Since those conversations were happening at the same time, Frog Pond did not have to be the last, best chance for the City to get everything it needed in affordability taken care

of, which would not be doable anyway as the analysis showed. The need to be flexible was critical, so the City did not lose out on opportunity because it was too rigid and not creative enough, or too lenient and avoided keeping the accountability to get as much affordability as possible.

- Regarding affordable housing, the City was in a conundrum with a green field in Frog Pond. The stats on Page 14 of the Affordable Housing Analysis showed the City's greatest need currently was very expensive housing and really inexpensive housing, which was not at all what the City was aiming for with Frog Pond. The only way the City would get to the lower end was through "infill-subsidized," taking existing market rate housing and subsidize based on a person, rather than subsidizing an entire building, like a HUD building. The City was missing the mark with its target of serving the 80 to 120 percent bracket in Frog Pond because the largest demand shown was in the 150 percent or more bracket. Basically, the city's largest housing need was at the top end and at the bottom end of the income scale. If Frog Pond was built out for the 80 to 120 percent target, people would buy the houses, however, how long the houses would stay in that target range was questionable; house values would inflate quickly.
 - **Mr. Pauly** clarified the tables on Page 14 were an extrapolation of existing population and reflected a gap for the 120 percent because that was not a strong part of the city's existing product mix and population.
- Wouldn't Exhibit 15 identify the City's housing need gap? The center portion of the chart showed the existing housing needs, and the only three needs were very high income, very low income, and extremely low income, which matched Exhibit 9 on Page 14.
 - If the needs were broken up differently, like middle income from 80 to 100 percent and then 100 to 120 percent, then that product mix might show up from 100 to 120 percent AMI.
 - **Mr. Pauly** replied he would follow up on that at the next work session.
 - It was a question of who the housing was being built for. Was housing being built for people in the 80 to 120 percent MFI who had not yet moved to the area or for people already in Wilsonville who wanted 120 percent MFI and above?
 - Exhibit 9 indicated there was a huge shortfall above 120 percent, which was probably above 150 percent AMI. If the city did not have housing for those people, they might buy a less affordable house or move out of Wilsonville to an area with houses that fit their lifestyle. Villebois was a well designed, built, and looking community. If that was what the City was shooting for and those housing types fit the 80 to 120 percent AMI, then that should be the City's goal. Right now, there was a huge shortfall in the less than 30 percent AMI, and the City had to figure out how to make housing available for that portion of the population, though perhaps not within Frog Pond.
 - Housing being built in Frog Pond West was all at 120 percent AMI and above.
 - In Exhibit 15, did the city distribution include Frog Pond West, both what had been built and what was planned to be built?
 - **Mr. Pauly** replied ECONorthwest was not present as Staff had not anticipated such detailed questions about the data, but they could be invited to the next work session.
 - Including Frog Pond West in the city distribution shown in Exhibit 15 on Page 20 of the attachment or page 49 of the PDF was one thing, but if not, it seemed to indicate the City had built some of the 120 percent and above, which changed the existing housing need, as well as the potential requirements for what the City needed to build in Frog Pond East and South. The answer was important to ensure the City was using all the data available. Currently, the proposed target showed the need for lots of high and middle income, and very little of the

other things the City needed. While it was not possible to solve the existing need gap for extremely low income in Frog Pond East and South on its own that did not mean the Commission should not try to do something meaningful to make progress. Having nothing or very little meant the existing gap would get larger. Defining targets for housing types was difficult without being able to see that picture more clearly.

- Staff had indicated that certain target housing types did not include low, very low, or extremely low-income housing, because that would require subsidies and some other support from the City. But if the City cared about affordable housing, why not identify targets for those housing types as well, even if that meant land did not get built on? If the City really cared about solving those problems, then maybe it had to wait for the money policies to be in place to support that type of development. The City did not have to build in Frog Pond East and South right now but was choosing to do so.
 - **Mr. Pauly** said the types of housing below 80 percent AMI would be similar to the 80 to 120 percent but subsidized. The regulations being discussed were about products rather than actual price points. State law had fairly specific limitations regarding what the City could do with inclusionary zoning in terms of requiring a certain income need be met and that was not being addressed directly in the discussion. The question was what product mix would be most likely to meet identified needs at market rate.
 - Hopefully, some projects came in with funding from different sources to make the houses more affordable, however the City could not require and guarantee that through zoning tools. Other tools beyond zoning were needed to accomplish that.
 - The idea was the City should have that right product mix to help facilitate the lower price points, even though the City could not force a price point on its own. The City should help provide the opportunity for smaller condos, smaller townhouses, and smaller detached houses.
 - **Mr. Pauly** agreed that made sense. He confirmed the Commission wanted Staff to further investigate whether ADUs, cottages, and other living options would be able to meet the needs at below 80 percent AMI at market rate and how those types could be facilitated.
 - Updating Exhibits 2 through 4 to break out cottages and ADUs was also suggested. Currently, the smallest type shown was two-bedroom condos. Perhaps adding those two product types would give the Commission and the rest of the City, a better feel for what those price points could be and whether cottages and ADUs could be included as targets for specific housing types.
- Two or three statements had been made which were all true at the same time. The target housing type was going to be targeted towards a certain AMI, which was fine. Affordability was not all a zoning issue, which was correct as well. However, during the discussion, a willingness or encouragement from some of the Commissioners, and perhaps all of the Commission, was to encourage the City to move faster in providing incentive tools to make affordable units available in the Frog Pond neighborhood, even if not through zoning. The City could come up with a policy or scheme that allowed the City to buy certain units and make those units available as affordable housing. The City should also act to ensure the units remained affordable in the future, as opposed to gentrifying. Staff should keep in mind Commissioner comments about encouraging and making affordability available more quickly.
- The City needed to identify what it was trying to accomplish in Frog Pond and make sure it did not move away from that. Given the 80 to 120 percent AMI, the City should keep its objectives for the neighborhood in line with affordable housing.

- There was no discussion regarding creating a visionary partnership between the kind of people the City was trying to create housing for and the kind of community it hoped to create as Wilsonville grew. What kind of industry and business was the City trying to attract? There should be some sort of partnership on that side because the businesses brought into the city would require employees and management who wanted to live in Wilsonville. If there was a clear idea of the community the City was building for in the future, it would help the City anticipate the kind of people who wanted to come live and buy in Wilsonville, so they could work in their own community and not have to commute.

Mr. Pauly continued the PowerPoint presentation, describing the purpose of a cap on housing variety and requesting some guidance on the criteria for Component 2. Was the cap about limiting too many expensive or detached single-family homes or was it about making sure there was variety throughout the neighborhood, even if that meant fewer, less expensive units?

The Commissioner comments and feedback regarding Component 2 Criteria was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Further development of the minimum and maximum types would prevent a predominance of any one housing type. The struggle would be to make it affordable, and cottages seem to be the best answer for making housing affordable, which meant there would be fewer single-family dwellings. It was neither good or bad, but variety could be controlled through minimums and maximums by type.
 - **Mr. Pauly** noted Component 2 generally regarded a maximum of any one type of in a given area. Did the City want to focus that cap on single-unit dwellings or apply the cap generally, including to market-rate housing that may be more affordable?
 - The City would want to include minimums and maximums across types because that would result in something similar to Villebois, which included townhouse buildings with one to five units, each with a different look and feel so there did not seem to be an overwhelming number of townhouses because the buildings were not similar in structure, color, and shape. The Village Center seemed to have a large number of multi housing units and townhouses with more and more single family on the edges.
 - Having minimums and maximums were a good approach, but balance of housing varieties was needed to ensure the neighborhood did not look like townhouses predominantly in a particular area and but looked like a homogenous community across the board.
 - Once the minimums were settled, the maximums would balance out more, but more information was needed.
- Some of the neighborhood design was based on the transect concept where the neighborhood center would have higher density. Similar to Villebois Village Center, more density would be in the village center. That density concentration was not an imbalance, but a concept that high density housing was placed near activity centers. The Commission had discussed balance overall in the neighborhood and that typically, affordable units were put in the most undesirable part of the neighborhood, out of the way and out of sight. The Commission decided early on that it did not want that and talked about Raj Chetty's research on how neighborhoods help lower income children develop a different outlook as a result of being cohorts of higher income children in the neighborhood. Mixing the affordability element with the type was the other aspect of balancing the neighborhood out and not having one type predominate in one area. The Commission had

discussions regarding those issues over the past several months and had agreements in those conversations.

- Requiring variety generally was important to ensure a cohesive neighborhood. Defining what the percentages should be throughout the neighborhood would help ensure the City would get what it was looking for in terms of the general look and feel. It could not be only X amount in a specific district, but the central area would be denser, and it would be spread out from there, but as long as the City had those percentages set up appropriately, it would be fine.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, thanked the Planning Commissioners for a great conversation, noting she did not envy their position. A lot was discussed about Villebois tonight, and she wanted to point out why the City was in a more difficult position currently. With Villebois, the City could geographically determine what housing types were going to go where with precision and created a transect of density and could set aside specific parcels for townhomes, for example. During the development of Villebois, there were times when the development community came to the City and said this was too challenging and asked to build single-family homes. The City said no and eventually the townhomes it wanted were eventually built on the set aside parcels. The townhomes inevitably offered a different price point than the single-family detached. Currently, the City had to comply with House Bill 2001, which was good in some ways because the bill required additional variety. However, the legislation did not allow the City to provide the same type of precision or known development pattern in a specific area. Before the City could designate certain areas for cottage housing, townhomes, or other specific product, but that type of precision or flexibility was no longer available. The City was now in a position of allowing many more housing types to be built on any given parcel, which made it more difficult to know whether the developer would choose a single-family home, townhouse, cottage cluster or ADU. The State rules were the reason the City was discussing minimum and maximum percentages. Whether the City landed on something precise or something that provided more flexibility with more of a range was an important factor in the City determining how to confirm the same type of variety without the same tool. She acknowledged it was a difficult exercise, but Staff appreciated the dialogue and questions. Staff would also appreciate knowing about anything the Planning Commissioners thought would help them better answer the questions and direct the City towards an answer.

Chair Heberlein appreciated the Planning Director's helpful comments, noting the Commissioners pointed questions and comments were not reflective of any displeasure on anything. The Commissioners just wanted to be sure they got it right. The problem could be solved if the City was able to come up with a creative way to buy the land; then it could replicate what was done in Villebois.

Mr. Pauly echoed the Planning Director's appreciation for the Planning Commission's discussion, which had been very helpful and provided good feedback. A lot of hard mental work had occurred in the last hour.

Saumya Kini and Joe Dills of MIG | APG, continued the PowerPoint presentation, describing the Public Realm and the key guiding principles used in its design, as well as the draft Public Realm materials included in the packet that would be refined and expanded upon based on the Commission's feedback. (Slides 11-23)

- Two street and block demonstration options were presented to meet the intent of providing a safe and low-stress accessible network of transportation options. Each option showed differences in the connection between Frog Pond Lane and 60th Ave, the location of the neighborhood park, pedestrian crossings across Advance Rd, and how homes fronted on Stafford Rd. (Slide 18)
 - **Mr. Pauly** added the movement of the neighborhood park and Type 1 up to be adjacent to the BPA easement reflected in Option 2 grew out of City Council comments about better utilizing the BPA easement, perhaps as an extension of the neighborhood park. Staff had messages into BPA to explore what options could be used on the easement, including parking.

All Commissioners preferred Street and Block Demonstration Option 2. Key additional comments and feedback regarding Options 1 and 2 were as follows (Slide 18):

- While having the main street flow into the park in Option 1 was nice, moving the park to flow into the easement, as shown in Option 2, made more sense. Not having houses face the busy Stafford Rd was preferred because a child could run out the door into the street, as opposed to running out into the back yard. Homebuyers might look elsewhere if the homes faced Stafford Rd.
- Moving the neighborhood park adjacent to the easement would give the City a lot more bang for its buck and the park fit well in that location. Moving Type 1 to abut the BPA easement was preferred and there were no issues with the other areas in Option 2.
- Connecting the park to the easement provided a gateway for the easement into the neighborhood, instead of turning one's back onto the easement like Option 1. Option 2, especially with Type 1 housing looking over the easement for a good portion, would make the easement a more defensible, owned space as part of the neighborhood. With Option 1, it was uncertain how the neighborhood would 'own' the easement.
 - Having a more boulevard-like design for one of the streets was preferred to connect the neighborhood park and easement with the future community park instead of a trail, which was envisioned as lines on a paved street.
 - With another park being planned, there should be some kind of connection between the two, and an open boulevard was preferred.
 - A well-designed wide, green sidewalk on one side of the street connecting the neighborhood park to the future community park through the downtown area or higher density residential area would create an even better, organic connection of the natural areas at the core of the neighborhood.
 - In Option 2, having no Type 1 housing in and around open space in the middle neighborhood area was good.
- Having the park next to and encroaching upon the BPA easement was a good use of additional real estate from the easement.
- The Type 1 intersection and connectivity with the easement and neighborhood park was a top feature of Option 2.
 - Given the neighborhood park's location in relation to the BPA easement, maybe the park's size could be reduced because the BPA easement space could be utilized, especially if the City was trying to maximize buildable space to reduce overall development costs.
 - An alternative was to steal a bit of space from the neighborhood park to create a linear park from the Grange through the high-value trees down to the commercial main street to have a connection between those two areas. Reducing the size of the neighborhood park while still

maintaining the connection to the BPA easement would enable a connection from the Grange to the commercial main street and make the treed area a bit more functional.

Two options were presented for the bike and pedestrian circulation in the Master Plan. Each option included differences in shared street versus bike lane use, trail connections, and bike lane connections between Frog Pond Lane and 60th Ave. (Slides 19-20)

- A cross-section concept for Advance Rd as it passed by the community park was also presented as one option for consideration where a collector cross-section and right-of-way would include generous 12-ft sidewalks, a planted median, bike lanes and incorporate existing power poles into a planter strip on the north side. Houses would front onto the community park to create a sense of integration of the park and eyes on the park as the street redeveloped. (Slide 21)

Key comments and feedback regarding the street cross-section, Bike and Pedestrian Circulation Options, and Park and Open Space Framework were as follows (Slides 19-23):

- **Mr. Pauly** understood the green connection between the community park and neighborhood park along what would be an extension of 60th Ave north of Advance Rd was probably a good candidate for the cross-section concept, as well as Brisband St.
- Overall, the Commissioners liked the options presented.
- If 60th Ave worked best to have a wider sidewalk, as proposed on Advance Rd, and provide a connector between the community park and neighborhood park that was fine. Having a connection to the downtown was good, too.
 - Would the green area close to the commercial area that had been suggested as linear park fit in any kind of a green space trail? It was an opportunity that would otherwise be missed. A green focal point was shown on the Park and Open Space Framework (Slide 22) but not necessarily any connection between the green area and the commercial area.
- The wider street going into Brisbane St was a good option.
- The Advance Rd concept was great and opened up the whole feel for a neighborhood.
- The presented options provided a lot of trail connections and bike paths. The Advanced Rd cross-section would tie East and South together nicely, even though there was a main artery between them.
- The Advance Rd cross-section showed the area at the proposed community park, but what did it look like another 750 ft farther down in the rural area and not in the City of Wilsonville? Would the same cross-section be used clear to the end and then dead end into nothing?
 - **Mr. Pauly** replied the north side of Advance Rd would continue to have the wide treatment shown in the concept. Beyond 60th Ave were homes unlikely to redevelop so the southside of the road would likely not continue at that point but have a curb. There was likely an opportunity to bring the trail up to make a strong connection through the neighborhood into the BPA easement, so the trail would not dead end into the Boeckman Dip but curve up into the BPA trail.
- Having a more emphasized tie in as far as bicycle circulation in the BPA easement would be good. Bike riders could go from Advance Rd through the BPA easement and then down, bypassing the entire section of neighborhood unless that was their destination. Having intentional access to the BPA easement and connections to those major streets at Stafford and Advance Rd would be key feature, as well as the tie-ins from the BPA easement to the neighborhood park going into the commercial center.

- Frog Pond East had trail connections to most all of the green focal points in the Parks and Open Space Framework, but there were no trail connections in Frog Pond South. Should those connections be considered? The trail in the lower-left quadrant below Meridian School should connect with the trail to Boeckman Creek School. Were there other trail connections between South and the future community park? (Slide 22)
- The green focal point at the northeast section north of the BPA easement seemed out of balance in terms of the center of that general neighborhood area. In fact, both green focal points shown north of the BPA easement could be more centrally located rather than being so close to the BPA easement.

Mr. Pauly briefly summarized the engagement activities being used to obtain feedback on the Master Plan, noting the City's survey work currently focused on the public realm. The survey text was in the meeting packet and Commissioners were encouraged to take the survey or provide comments on the topics of the survey. The City was working with the School District on holding an open house on August 23rd regarding the design of Frog Pond School. City Staffs were also working internally across the Planning, Parks, and Engineering Departments on the Frog Pond West Park and Boeckman Corridor Project.

Mr. Dills confirmed the project team had a nice set of summertime outreaches going on.

Chair Heberlein thanked everyone for all the time and effort being put into the project.

INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (July 18, 2022) (No staff presentation)
5. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, stated the Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan was moved out a month to address some concerns, including the demographic issues discussed in the last work session. Otherwise, the work program was looking as planned.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Heberlein adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for
Mandi Simmons, Planning Administrative Assistant