

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8, 2018
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Minutes approved as
presented at the
September 12, 2018
PC Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Jerry Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm. Those present:

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Ron Heberlein, Phyllis Millan, Simon Springall, and Kamran Mesbah. Peter Hurley was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Tod Blankenship, Dwight Brashear, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Nicole Hendrix, Eric Loomis, Mike McCarty, Jennifer Scola, Brian Stevenson, Jeanna Troha, and Kimberly Veliz.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. CITIZEN'S INPUT

This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Consideration of the July 11, 2018 Planning Commission minutes
The July 11, 2018 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

V. LEGISLATIVE HEARING

A. Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Master Plan (McCarty)
Continued from the May 9, 2018 Planning Commission hearing

Chair Greenfield noted that since the hearing had been continued, the public record was still open. He read the legislative hearing procedure into the record.

Mike McCarty, Parks Director, noted the consultants from GreenPlay would not be present as he believed Staff could answer the Commission's questions. The final version of the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Master Plan was being presented, and Staff believed both the Commission's and City Council's comments, concerns, and suggestions had been addressed. He thanked Recreation Coordinator, Erica Baylor, City Staff Charlie Tso, and GreenPlay. The planning process had not been easy, and GreenPlay had helped Staff make all of the changes.

Brian Stevenson, Parks and Recreation Program Manager, presented the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Master Plan via PowerPoint presentation, which included a review of the Master Plan's process, its purpose, and a recap of the key findings heard from the community during the planning process. He also presented how the recommendations previously made by the Planning Commission and City Council had been addressed, all of which was included in the Staff report. Staff's key comments and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows with additional comments from the Commission as noted:

- Staff was still working on the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Plan, so no copy of the draft plan was available at this time; however, Objective 3.9 (Page 133 of the Master Plan) was included to ensure an IPM was included. (Slide 8)
 - Staff intended to present a draft IPM to City Council at the September 6th meeting, but the draft would not be presented to the Planning Commission for review prior to Council. Staff confirmed copies of the draft IPM would be sent to the Commission once the draft was prepared for the City Council packets.

Commissioner Springall said he liked the objectives and actions, and was very interested in the details of how the IPM would work. He asked if Staff had consulted with any outside agencies.

- Tod Blankenship, Parks Supervisor, replied Northwest Alternative Pesticides was integral in developing an IPM plan that Staff was now integrating into the Memorial Park Master Plan, along with content from existing plans by Metro, Lake Oswego, and Eugene.

Mr. Stevenson continued his presentation, noting Natural Resources was now separate and included as Objective 3.10. (Page 133, Slide 9)

- Mr. Blankenship clarified that funding for the Urban Forestry Management Plan was provided on July 1, 2018 but no work had yet been done on the plan at this point. The program was driven by the Community Development Department and Staff was not certain when it would be completed.

Chair Greenfield asked what requirements existed for Bee City and Tree City designations with regard to pesticides.

Mr. Blankenship responded that the Bee City designation included some items that required a reduction in use of chemical pest control products. He believed the Tree City designation would follow along the same lines.

Commissioner Springall understood the Tree City designation regarded the replacement of trees and a tree code, which the City already had.

- He confirmed that the scope of the Urban Forestry Plan would also include street trees and noted that last summer, SMART interns gave a presentation on their survey of street trees in Wilsonville's neighborhoods. Some neighborhoods had trees that were more affected by construction than others. Although a Public Works issue, he believed that work would provide a significant contribution to the Urban Forestry Plan.
 - Mr. Blankenship agreed, adding one of those interns was currently a Parks Staff member and working to add to the existing tree inventory.

Commissioner Milan confirmed that a list of recommended types of replacement street trees was developed as part of the survey done by the interns last summer that could be included in the Urban Forestry Management Plan.

Mr. Stevenson continued the presentation, describing the changes made in response to the Planning Commission's feedback regarding synthetic turf. (Slide 10) He read Objective 1.8 (Page 127), noting Action 1.8.a now called out safety and environmental concerns, as well as the financial projections for construction and replacement.

Chair Greenfield suggested that using the word "consider" in Objective 1.8 was inconsistent with the action verb "develop" used in Action 1.8.a. The action could be read as an endorsement and directive to install synthetic turf, which was not the Commission's intention. While he would prefer a community referendum on the issue, at least the word "develop" should be changed to "consider" in the action item.

Commissioner Postma suggested amending Action 1.8.a to include, "Develop priorities for *the consideration of* installation of synthetic turf fields..."

Chair Greenfield and Commissioners Millan and Springall agreed the language change addressed the issue.

Chair Greenfield believed the Commission should deliver a document that had a little more flexibility for City Council, as they would be the final decision makers on this sensitive issue.

Mr. Stevenson continued, noting Action 1.6c on Page 125 was added to make Public Art a standalone action item; previously it was tied in with other park amenities.

Commissioner Mesbah recalled the Master Plan was to include an initiative to identify locations where public art had been obscured over the years. If some of those locations were in parks, he presumed the current language addressed both existing and new public art.

Chair Greenfield agreed it would not hurt to mention that in the Master Plan, but noted the more fundamental consideration was that another City body be tasked with starting an inventory of what already existed and asking the community what it wanted. He believed City Council was already considering an Arts Commission, but it would not hurt to cross reference that in the Master Plan.

- Mr. Stevenson responded that Staff supported including public art within the Master Plan and if that commission ever came to fruition, Staff would support public art within the parks. However, Staff would be concerned if that commission decided the existing pads within the parks were not the best choices or locations anymore. Staff made the conscious decision to leave the action item language general, to support public art and allow a body solely focused on art to make the detailed decisions.

Commissioner Mesbah explained he had asked because he knew of an art piece in a park that was obscured by weeds and brush. He wanted Staff to highlight the existing art pieces while featuring new ones as parks expanded.

Commissioner Postma said he preferred the general language recommended by Staff because it left the door open for broader action.

Commissioner Mesbah said he would be fine with the general language as well as long as it included both existing and new art pieces.

Chair Greenfield confirmed Action 1.6.c would be amended to read, “Explore opportunities to feature **existing and future** public art...”

Mr. Stevenson explained that Action 1.7.h was added to open conversation about the future development to be considered within the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. (Slide 12)

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Said he did not believe the first bullet point under Action 1.7.h regarding park facilities in Basalt Creek, was necessary since the next bullet point generally ensured adequate park facilities in all future planning areas.
 - Ms. Bateschell explained a question had been raised specifically about the Basalt Creek Planning Area, which was only recently brought into the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), and since Basalt Creek was a joint effort with another city, not a lot of details were laid out for parks planning. She agreed the second bullet would incorporate the first, adding the Commission could decide to keep both bullet points or rely on the second, broader bullet alone.
- Noted the City would still be responsible to ensure adequate park facilities existed in Wilsonville’s portion of the Basalt Creek Planning Area, which the second bullet seemed to address.

Chair Greenfield believed the Commission had called out this issue specifically because no account had been made of the Basalt Creek Canyon in the inventory of present and future parks. He believed the Commission was responsible for the inclusion of the first bullet point.

Commissioner Mesbah suggested the first bullet be a sub-bullet of the second bullet.

Chair Greenfield confirmed the following addition, "...in all future planning areas, including **the Basalt Creek Planning Area and** areas added to the UGB and annexed into the City", noting that then the first bullet could be deleted.

Commissioner Mesbah:

- Noted at the last meeting on the Master Plan, he had mentioned as the UGB expanded, the City should identify and target natural preservation areas, like the 15-acre Willamette Meridian Landing site outside the UGB, in its long-range planning, unless such areas were identified by Metro or some other entity. Although referenced as part of the last bullet, he was not sure where this action could be addressed more specifically.
 - Mr. Blankenship explained that while not called out in the PowerPoint (Slide 12), a separate action item was included in the Master Plan about acquiring natural areas or open space.
 - Ms. Bateschell added that regionally, Metro does map out Title 3 and Title 13 natural area lands that were consistent with Goal 5 for the State. During the comprehensive, master, and area planning for new UGB areas, the City considered those regional layers to gain information about natural resources, and existing conditions, and then highlighted the natural resources that need to be protected or mapped. Staff then determined the accuracy of that information when bringing the area in for master planning. Once the land is annexed, Staff did the on-ground testing to determine the accuracy of the specific delineations of the natural areas.

Commissioner Mesbah asked if Staff looked at the accuracy based on what was important to Metro or to Wilsonville.

- Ms. Bateschell explained that they go hand-in-hand in terms of the classification system, but Wilsonville took a more conservative approach. Staff was able to use the City's local regulations as long as the resource delineations complied with the regional layers, and Wilsonville's standards went above and beyond. She confirmed this was all part of the planning process.

Mr. Stevenson concluded the presentation by reviewing the elements City Council's wanted encompassed in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. (Slide 13)

Chair Greenfield noted the map on Page 51, which indicated future schools in magenta, should be corrected as the Meridian Park School was shown as a future school; the map should simply indicate it as "school."

- Mr. Blankenship explained Staff had been working on the Master Plan for more than a year, and when the mapping started, Meridian Park was a future school at that time.
- Commissioner Springall noted the map on Page 54 needed to be corrected as well.

Commissioner Millan:

- Noted Objective 1.5 on ADA accessibility indicated there would be an ongoing self-evaluation and continued implementation. She asked who would review the implementation plan and where was the action item about doing so.
 - Mr. Blankenship responded an ADA assessment was completed in 2014, and of course, ADA accessibility was addressed with any new construction. Implementing the plan was expensive, so Staff was chipping away at low hanging fruit, such as by adding concrete slabs to areas where additional turn around space was needed, etc.

- Asked if the City had a list of items it wanted to accomplish and some way to determine if the list was getting done as the objective seemed a bit vague, rather than stating that the City wanted to accomplish x, y, z within a certain timeframe. She understood it would take time as resources were available. She asked who reviewed the initial study to determine how the City was progressing.
 - Mr. Blankenship noted the 200-page assessment laid out the objectives and a timeline. He believed the overall timeline was 10 to 15 years to have everything implemented and taken care of.
 - He confirmed Staff within his department tracked the progress being made.
- Noted the action “continue to implement” implied that there would be more of a check and balance process and she was not sure the language said that. She was looking for some evaluative criteria to determine whether or not Staff was getting there, falling behind or failing.
 - Mr. Blankenship clarified there was no evaluation criteria, currently but noted Staff could certainly review the progress on the assessment quarterly or biannually, for example.
- Explained it seemed like an action to her, and the word “continue” was not an action. She recognized that Staff would not fix it all tomorrow, but some kind of periodic checkpoint was needed or the City would never get there.
 - Mr. Stevenson clarified the ADA plan was citywide; it was not necessarily specific to Parks.

Chair Greenfield said he was going to ask if there was a published City plan to monitor ADA compliance.

- Ms. Bateschell replied she was not clear if performance monitoring was included within the ADA plan. The Engineering Division of the Community Development Department was responsible for the ADA Plan. Engineering published the plan and highlighted the different projects that needed to come into full compliance. She would talk to Engineering and get back to the Commission on what performance measurements were laid out in the ADA plan and how often Staff would revisit it to see how far the City was with regard to project implementation.

Commissioner Springall:

- Thanked the Parks Staff for doing a nice job of incorporating a more explicit focus on natural resources. He looked forward to seeing the IPM and would like to discuss it, although, he recognized it would go to City Council.
- Noted the capital cost estimates included in the action plans and asked why the Frog Pond Community Park would cost about \$12.5 million. He did not see anything else comparable in the Master Plan.
 - Mr. McCarty replied the cost for the 10-acre park considered potential synthetic turf fields, lighting, drainage, etc. Staff looked at other cities and the estimated cost for sports fields was \$4 million to \$5 million per five acres. Staff did not know when the City might get the money. As seen in other projects, the City might plan for something two months from now that would not happen for two years, then all of sudden, there was a 20 percent cost increase, so Staff was also trying to project a bit since construction costs were going up every day.

Chair Greenfield called for public testimony regarding the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Steve Benson, 8525 SW Wilson Lane, Wilsonville, stated he wanted to use his pet peeve in a broader sense. His pet peeve was that he could not get a kayak launch attached to the dock at Memorial Park because of ADA rules. Even though people just walk down with their kayaks and launch, apparently the access from the parking lot up above did not meet the standard. The launch idea had been in the Master Plan for quite a while. When going from master plan to master plan with the same items remaining in each version, but never get completed, how did the City assess whether those items should still be included in the master plan? He asked about having some kind of evaluation and explanation as to why an item had not yet been done.

Chair Greenfield responded anyone asking that question could get the process started.

Mr. Benson suggested that when a master plan expired with uncompleted items, an evaluation of those items should be done.

Chair Greenfield said that technically, master plans did not expire, they were updated.

Mr. Benson said he got frustrated over things did not getting done and when the master plans get updated, it would be nice to have something explaining exactly why an item did not get completed. It would require a bit of time, but it should be part of the master planning process.

- He clarified the kayak launch was not the only item, adding it would be really hard to get it in there because the turf for Memorial Park was a higher priority in the Master Plan than completing the parking lot in the back of the park and working on the road going down to the boat launch. If things in a master plan were done in order, and the City never got funding for multi-million dollar turf fields, when would the other items get done? All of the items in that part of the Master Plan would just sit and not get completed until higher priority items got done. If the City never got funding for them, then a whole lot would never get done.

Commissioner Mesbah noted that was a global critique of planning that Planning had been trying to deal with for a couple of decades now. The Master Plan document was typically reflective of the desires of the community. If a boat launch continued to be desired, it would continue to show up in some plan. Mr. Barnes had highlighted a very important point, however. When planning, the City typically did not have a detailed coverage of the implementation steps necessary for the wishes, and there was a reason for that; no one ever wanted to sit in front of a commission and tell them that the boat launch everybody wanted might be funded in 200 years. The Master Plan items told the residents that they had been heard, that the item was put in the plan, and if the City came up with the money, it could be done. If the City did not come up with the money, then the residents, who presumably did not want to pay high taxes, were at fault.

- He agreed Mr. Benson had an important point. He had been talking to Staff about starting to have realistic steps towards implementation in all of the City's plans. Prioritizing was the first step, but putting a timeline on it was a second step. The Department of Transportation did that all the time, and would say when something would not ever happen given the current funding. Items were carried forward because they were important, but no funding was available.

Mr. Benson suggested sunsetting some things. For example, if the City did not get a turf field in by a certain date, then smaller priced items behind it could be implemented.

Commissioner Heberlein responded that just because something was a lower priority did not mean it would not get implemented. It was a matter of political will. If City Council decided that a lower priority item needed to be done, it would get done, and that would come down to enough citizens voicing their desires for that specific item so that it would become an urgent issue rather than just something important in a document.

Commissioner Mesbah added another step to consider was grassroots fundraising for something that a group of kayakers wanted as a public service. It would be laudable if enough people were interested in something and started doing it. And, it would happen because they would be offering the Parks Department funding do the project.

Mr. Benson said that was not really what was in the way; it was the ADA standards for getting to the boat launch, and that was a lot pricier than just putting the boat launch in itself.

Commissioner Postma confirmed the boat launch was actually part of the Memorial Park Master Plan. As a kayaker, he watched that extensively. It was expected to be part of the boat dock at Memorial Park, and had been on the Plan for some time.

Mr. Benson added another one would also be in the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan.

Commissioner Postma replied actually, no. He believed the last iteration of the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan that came before the Commission did not have it in favor of the walk down portion for the current road.

Mr. Benson said he did not know how that would meet ADA standards. The decline was steep.

Commissioner Postma added that the grade was steep over to the docks in that park as well.

Mr. Benson noted there was a plan for a boat building.

Chair Greenfield confirmed there was no further public testimony and closed the public hearing at 6:58 pm. He called for Commission discussion.

Chair Greenfield stated that since the draft plan was an important document that should be widely read and for some time, he suggested some formatting adjustments to Attachment A. The whole thing seemed to be done in the form of a spreadsheet. The Goals were highlighted in an olive color, which made the type illegible; however, it was distinct from the Action, which was a brighter green color. If the table was broken above each of the goals, the goals would be more distinguished and easier to find. It would also affect some of the pagination. In a couple places, the olive line was separated from the rest of the table that it pertained to on different pages, which was especially confusing when trying to find the goal that governed a section.

- He clarified he was recommending a table break, not necessarily a page break. Though kind of trivial, it was a simple thing that would make the document easier to use.

Commissioner Springall said he had a similar problem. His eye picked out the action with the nice, thick, green bar, but then he had to backtrack to find the objective, which was hard to see. He agreed the formatting needed adjusting.

Chair Greenfield said he would consider a different color for the objectives.

Mr. Stevenson confirmed that on Page 127, the Commission wanted white space between the end of Action 1.8a and Goal 2.

Mr. McCarty added the reason colors like neon yellow were not used was because Staff was trying to stay with the City's colors.

Commissioner Postma moved to adopt LP18-0003, recommending approval and adoption of the 2018 Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Master Plan, with revisions to Actions 1.6.c on Page 125, Actions 1.7.h on Page 127, and Actions 1.8.a on Page 127, as indicated on the record; correcting any maps showing Meridian Creek Middle School as a future school; and other non-substantive considerations regarding document formatting. Commissioner Mesbah seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. McCarty expressed his sincere appreciation for all the work Tami Bergeron, in Planning, had done to help with the Master Plan.

- B. Boones Ferry Park Master Plan (McCarty)
Continued to October 10, 2018

Commissioner Mesbah stepped out of the meeting chambers.

Chair Greenfield opened the public hearing at 7:06 pm.

Mr. McCarty stated Staff asked that the hearing be continued to October 10th because they did not feel like the document they would have presented was the best it could be.

Commissioner Postma moved to continue the hearing on the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan to October 10, 2018. Commissioner Millan seconded the motion, which passed 5 to 0.

Commissioner Mesbah returned to dais at this time.

VI. WORK SESSION

A. Town Center Plan (Bateschell)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Manager, introduced project team members, Alex Dupey, Project Manager and MIG Consulting, and Associate Planner Jennifer Scola. The project team began visioning for Town Center with the community about 18 month ago, and since then a series of design workshops were held to talk with people about their preferences for Town Center as well as involvement with about 30 events last summer to hear the community's ideas for a community design concept. That community design concept was taken back out to the community to vet it and to ensure that what Staff had been hearing was right, to address any concerns, and to identify any areas needing more work before the concept was finalized into a plan and details regarding design, the Development Code, and implementation actions were created.

Ms. Bateschell and Mr. Dupey presented the Community Concept Plan for Town Center via PowerPoint, reviewing the key takeaways and feedback received from community outreach activities that influenced the revisions made to the community design concept since the June Task Force meeting, as well as the concept's key considerations and design elements. The project team also described components for implementing the Community Concept, noting that at this time, specific direction was needed from the Planning Commission with regard to design guidelines and the Development Code.

Comments from the Planning Commission as well as feedback on the questions from the project team were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Although every detail did not need to be prescriptive, a higher level of design requirements made sense for the Main Street District (MSD) versus other areas.
- The entire Town Center area should have more stringent design standards. People tend to stretch guidelines as far as possible which results in losing a little of the character or the overall look and feel desired. For example, as time progressed, Villebois developments did not strictly adhere to the Pattern Book, which degraded the original vision. On the other hand, standards that were too stringent would discourage development.
- Land ownership consolidation and phasing were important to consider. Applying stringent standards to multiple property owners who might develop at different times could become a less workable.
 - Ms. Bateschell confirmed both the east and west sides of Main Street had only two land owners. When laying out the street plan, the team tried very hard to avoid existing businesses. For the Main Street extension from Courtside south, the drive aisle would pretty much be within the parking lot (Slide 17). The other, more local streets would be constructed as part of a private development and would mimic the block pattern that had been discussed.
 - The City would have the freedom to be a bit more stringent with Main Street because the land ownership was more consolidated. The Courtside extension going west only had a handful of owners as well.
- Should the Development Code focus on standards or guidelines? (Slide 30)
 - The Task Force recommended more regulations and stricter standards and design guidelines for the MSD because it was intended to be the central feature of the plan. (Slide 19) Concerns had been expressed that a lot of new urbanism resulted in a hokey, Disney-like downtown area. The idea was to make sure that the creativity of the owners and their architects were not stunted by a lot of short-sighted preferences that did not age well over time and to ensure authentic designs. The intent was that the guidelines be qualitative so designers would look at the motivation, hopes and ideas the community had for Town Center and the come up with creative ways to achieve it.

- Mr. Dupey confirmed that was the intent of the Task Force's recommendations. Initially, the design guidelines, particularly for Main Street, were developed with a heavy regulatory hand, spelling out which buildings should be made of wood with brick, for example. Now, the guidelines focused on building placement, the percentage of glass at the ground floor, where building entrances should be, and weather coverings, which were a big deal. The guidelines provided some direction about permeability and visibility through the building, but left that interpretation to the architect or designer. The question was how far to take that regulation versus the standard. The key thing for Main Street was the location of the parking and the building.
 - He explained that Belmar, a new urbanist development in Lakewood, Colorado created a main street similar to what Wilsonville was considering and had centralized parking by connecting adjacent parking lots. Parking behind the buildings could have multiple land owners, but the City could require that the parking areas be connected to avoid chopping up the spaces in the back. This would result in the desired development occurring at an incremental level rather than having a master developer for the entire MSD. Parking would be behind the buildings or on the street; whether it was structured or tuck under would be up to the City or the developer.
- While there is a balance between design standards and form based code, pure form based code often gets away from prohibitive or permitted lists, which could be difficult because some items/elements are not wanted in a development. The project team was recommending a more balanced or hybrid approach of having a series of more traditional Code elements, as well as design standards, which would be similar to how a form based code might look.
 - For example, building location would likely be more flexible, depending on the area; however, the City would probably want to be more stringent about building location on Main Street to have a strong pedestrian orientation. Larger office buildings or mixed use residential buildings not on Main Street could have more flexibility. The overarching vision, particularly with the harmonious design, was to develop an area that was pedestrian oriented, easy to get around, and had buildings that were inviting to pedestrians. That could be accomplished in a number of ways and regulated at a number of different levels to provide flexibility, depending on the district.
 - Key concepts like being pedestrian friendly would be standardized but those elements would be a bit more prescriptive in the main area. (MSD) The Commercial Mixed Use (C-MU) District could allow parking behind and on the sides of buildings, but Main Street would only allow parking behind the buildings.
- Should we reduce the current maximum block length of 530 ft to 400 ft? (Slide 31)
 - If the City adopted the recommended block length of 400 ft, it would be critical to provide additional accessibility. Bike paths could be in amongst the blocks and even if not marked, they would be accessible. The key piece of the pedestrian access was that it could be combined with parking access if designed correctly. Additionally, the access could be shared by removing curb cuts, which was better for bicycles and pedestrians, and focusing on 200 ft to 250 ft connections between buildings. Consolidating the access to parking would also be critical in preventing parking lots from becoming through-ways.
 - The townhomes at Orenco Station had covered parking and the surface parking was for the apartments and commercial spaces.
 - The Orenco example showed a lot of asphalt; more greenscape was desired for Town Center. (Slide 33)
 - One concern with 400-ft blocks would be that mid-block pedestrian accesses would not be defensible spaces if not designed well. People would not want to use those areas as a thoroughfare on foot at night. Lighting would be important, and highlighting the access as a public path, even though it went through private parking would help. Perhaps vendor carts could be located in those areas, or some other stable activity so that those transitioning through were not going through no man's land.
 - The parking lots should not look like institutional parking lots.

- The Planning Commission generally consented to having a maximum 400 ft block length.
- Do the proposed cross-section types and locations fit the vision?
 - The bike/pedestrian transitions on Slide 35 were inconsistent going north and south along Park Place and the Park Place Extension. Bike lanes were on both sides on North Park Place and then on Park Place at Town Center Park, there was a buffered bike lane/cycle track on one side, so at each of those transition points families and children would be transitioning a street. The transitions should be minimized as much as possible for better flow specifically through that street area.
 - The project team explained that those transitions were developed based on feedback regarding the concept of the cycle track coming from the bridge, down Main Street, and along the southern part of the park to connect south to Memorial Dr. Additionally, due to the redesign of traffic flow on Wilsonville Rd, the intersection at Main Street allowed for people to go in any direction. Town Center Lp W had limited flow of direction. The community indicated a lot of support for most of the pedestrian and bike activity to go on Rebekah St. because the direct flow from the Town Center Lp W intersection south to the library would not have full vehicular traffic flow, which would feel safer. Currently, that intersection does not have full pedestrian connectivity, so in the long term, some of the traffic flow and how the intersections along Wilsonville Rd are handled would be modified, focusing pedestrian and bike connectivity north and south of Wilsonville Rd to Town Center Lp W and Rebekah St.
 - There were awkward transitions for bike and pedestrian connectivity because the community had prioritized the diagonal connection that split off. One split went down Town Center Lp W and south. The other split went down Rebekah St and south. That might not be where the City ultimately wanted the connectivity to occur in this plan. There were existing bike lanes on Parkway north of confluence of Town Center Lp W and Town Center Lp E, so a transition could be made there and continue the cycle track north. However, the size of the streets needed to be considered; particularly the Park Place Extension moving from Wilsonville Rd up to Town Center Park. The Concept Plan recommended on street parking and wide sidewalks. Bike lanes could be added, but that would require more right-of-way, which was why other roads were recommended. Bikes could share a slow traffic street.
 - Streets should not be so wide and complex that they divided Town Center into two distinct districts.
 - A cycle track or bike lane at the existing Park Place moving north from Town Center Park would be one good transition. It would be important to be aware of what the Main Street Extension cross section south would look like.
 - The burden of the MSD would be to clearly establish the sense of place for Town Center and that would certainly be more difficult if Park Place became too heavy with traffic.
 - A lot of pedestrian activity was expected in the MSD, so the plan recommended 10-ft travel lanes and on-street parking, which would help prevent through traffic. Town Center Lp E was the desired route to reach Town Center.
 - The transitions would be a design challenge because issues regarding existing conditions and desired functionality would have to be resolved at each point.
- Should specific building materials be required or more general building design standards? (Slide 37)
 - More eclecticism and architectural variety was preferred as long as it was not glaringly inconsistent. Town Center would take a long time to develop and development would start from an established built area.
 - For the most part, the Task Force wanted varied articulation to provide breaks in buildings and changes in planes. However, some people did not want stronger standards.
 - Both businesses and housing units would likely prefer having some distinction in their architecture.
 - Ms. Bateschell confirmed the Commission agreed to prohibiting a few things, and allowing articulation but also flexibility in terms of precise materials.
 - Main Street could have stronger weather protection, like marquee awnings that extend across the entire building, which were historic for a lot of buildings. The mixed-used areas might only need weather protection over entrances. A key recommendation from the Task Force was to have year-

round use, so a continuous weather protected pathway, especially for the Main Street Area, was critical.

- Should we permit one-story commercial buildings? Should the size of retail or commercial space be limited? (Slide 41)
 - No limitations should be set on height or square footage. The City would still have to let the market figure out what it could build. Too many limitations could prohibit development.
 - One-story commercial buildings were fine. Possibly limiting the size of retail use in the MSD or parts of the MSD was suggested, but not in other areas.
 - Proximity to some sort of anchor store was a determining factor as to whether some businesses would work, so having limits that would prohibit an anchor tenant was a concern.
 - One-story development would be a total waste of the Town Center in working to make it a gem of a downtown area. FAR requirements and prohibiting one-story developments were suggested.
 - One-story developments would not accommodate mixed-uses in most cases. The City should wait on development in Town Center until the market was ready to do at least a two-story development. Madison had to wait 12 years before well-designed, mixed-use developments were built on lots that were parking lots for car dealerships on their main thoroughfare.
 - One impetus for redeveloping Town Center was to make better use of the real estate, which currently was largely wasted.
 - It was okay to wait for the market to catch up in order to achieve the vision for Town Center. However, if the City was too restrictive, the market might just ignore Town Center.
 - Neither the Task Force nor the community feedback indicated any real push for single-story commercial in any part of Town Center.
 - Multi-story buildings were required to achieve a vibrant busy center, so at least two stories should be required.
 - Following a brief discussion about requiring multi-story buildings throughout the entire Town Center area, and the Commission generally agreed multi-stories were critical in the MSD. However, requiring multiple stories in the entire 100-acre area could be prohibitive to development.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted the project team was working a development feasibility analysis and the initial results had been shared with the Task Force. Staff intended to share the analysis with the Planning Commission in October. The Commission had provided clear direction about Main Street and the analysis would help inform the Commission's discussion on more specifically on other districts, particularly the mixed-use and neighborhood mixed-use districts.
 - The general principle of increasing massing toward the highway had already been discussed. The most logical place for single-story buildings would be in the neighborhood mixed-use area.

Ms. Bateschell suggested continuing the work session to the October meeting, noting the next topic, off-street parking, was a big one, but that time had run out for this agenda item. She asked that the Commissioners provide direction on off-street parking tonight so it could be incorporated into the rest of the presentation in October.

Mr. Dupey noted a high-level parking analysis was done of the area. Some of the parking in the area was heavily used, but much of it was not. Where there was more disconnected parking areas, like in the southwest corner, the parking was pretty occupied and active. Fry's, the theater, and the northwest corner had excess parking, so there were no parking problems within Town Center. Key considerations were the current parking standards, parking standards for mixed-use if mixed-use was introduced to Town Center, and smaller business exemptions for retail and restaurants less than 3,000 or 5,000 sq ft. Other jurisdictions like Tigard and Hillsboro had interesting parking standards. Tigard had a zero-minimum standard, which allowed the market to decide how much parking should be built. Downtown Hillsboro used a lot of Planning Director discretion for parking levels. Overall, parking spaces were going to a per unit basis as opposed to a per bedroom basis for residential. There was a variety of standards for mixed-use that used a graduated system. Wilsonville counted

up all the potential uses in a business and required that much parking. However, Town Center would be a different type of development than was typical in Wilsonville.

Comments and information requests from the Commission regarding parking and the Town Center Community Concept was as follows:

- Would mixed-use, commercial/residential, business/residential, or business/commercial areas reduce the net need for parking because of time sharing? Did it work to effectively reduce net required parking for mixed-use buildings? Examples of where that had been attempted were requested.
- The alignment on Town Center Lp W was important and had not yet been discussed as the existing alignment was a potential wasted opportunity.
- Although not part of the Town Center design, the other side of the bike/pedestrian bridge on the other side of I-5 did not have a lot of space. Boones Ferry Rd was very crowded and people drive very fast. Had any thought been given as to what would happen to the other side of that bridge?
 - It seemed that the I-5 bike/pedestrian bridge had moved to the south from where it had been drawn on earlier maps.
 - Ms. Bateschell responded that it had not moved too far. Originally, the vacant corner property across Town Center Lp W was marked with a big park and the bridge came straight into that property. A development application for that property had been submitted to the City during the Town Center planning process, so Staff marked the potential bridge location at the boundary line, thinking the City might look at a little bit of right-of-way from each parcel along the boundary line.
 - The Commission had heard earlier that this type of crossing could be a catalyst for development on either side of the bridge. The end section of Barber St as it came towards Boones Ferry Rd was probably also right for redevelopment given the large companies on the south side and much smaller buildings on the north side of that street. There was opportunity for cross town connectivity as well as for catalyzing further development adjacent to Town Center, so it was important to make sure that connection worked properly on both sides of the freeway.
 - That connection should extend to the transit center, especially if the City was trying to build an area where people did not have to use their cars. The connections should start at the transit mall, allowing people to walk or use scooters to cross over to the main area.
 - The project team responded that could certainly be put in the plan as a guideline for the bridge design and access. It was important to make a connection beyond the end of the bridge. The City was not designing that side of I-5, but the team could certainly include an item that connectivity had to be provided as future guidance for the bridge design.
 - Design work for the bridge would begin in early to spring of 2019 and including the recommendations in the plan could inform that design work.

Ms. Bateschell reviewed the Next Steps (Slide 47) and invited any Commissioners with thoughts on specific language email her so she could integrate their direction, comments, and edits as early as possible to get the process moving further along faster.

- She hoped to make the feasibility study available to the Commission prior to the October meeting, noting she had just received the revised draft and was waiting on one more piece. She hoped to have some type of economic summit or other event targeted toward the business community to discuss the feasibility study and development opportunities based on the plan. Staff was trying to determine a date, but hoped to hold the event this fall and that the Chamber of Commerce would help with the event.

Commissioner Postma said he would do what he could to help with that process. He noted it would take longer for the business community to digest the information, so it would be a harder to get quick input on those topics.

Chair Greenfield suggested having a short informational item on the feasibility study on the September agenda.

Ms. Bateschell noted she would be absent from the September meeting, but someone on the project team could present the study, or at least, share the document if it was ready.

B. SMART Program Enhancement Strategy (Brashear)

Dwight Brashear, SMART Transit Director, presented the Program Enhancement Strategy via PowerPoint, noting that an explanation of HB2017 was included in the Staff report. He reminded that in June, the Commission reviewed and discussed a project list SMART had presented. Since the last time he met with the Commission, TriMet established a timeline for delivery of the project list that all sub-recipients, including SMART, had to follow in order to receive funding. About a month ago, however, it was discovered that the timeline TriMet had established for delivery of the project was inconsistent with the timeline that ODOT had established. SMART had attempted to point out the inconsistency to both parties and believed a correction would be made. However, not until last Thursday and Friday, TriMet and ODOT confirmed that everyone needed to follow ODOT's timeline. Therefore, SMART had to shift gears and be flexible.

- In 2017, the Commission approved SMART's Transit Master Plan (TMP), which was budget neutral. However, the plan's Appendix B listed the types of projects SMART would do in Wilsonville if money were no object. Finding that the plan met all of the requirements of HB2017, SMART quickly put some numbers to it, and asked City Council to amend the TMP as it related to Appendix B, which they did on July 2nd.
- SMART formed a committee for all of the small providers in Clackamas County, who appointed him as committee chair. Through two meetings, the committee was able to get five project lists and the plans for each of the providers through. SMART was prepared to submit Appendix B, which went through two years of public outreach and was approved by the Planning Commission. However, SMART wanted to keep the plan presented to the Commission in June moving because it was more robust and would allow SMART to go after three out of four pots of money.
- He explained that the Staff was before the Commission to provide some updates on some of the public outreach as well as the results of that outreach.

Nicole Hendrix, SMART Transit Management Analyst, noted that when SMART presented to the Commission in June, the survey was still ongoing, so only partial public comment results were provided at that time. She continued the PowerPoint, reviewing the content and questions of the Future Services Survey as well as the complete survey results, noting that no out of town fares scored the lowest on the prioritized list.

Mr. Brashear added it was important to note that some projects on the prioritized list from the survey that overlapped with projects on Appendix B, which created better opportunity for SMART. Even prior to the rule making, ODOT had indicated that the money would be flexible, which meant there was no requirement that projects followed the order of the priority list. Some projects, like increasing service to Salem, might take a little longer to get underway because SMART would have to work with Salem Chariots, who would have to pay its portion of that service. Some of the low hanging fruit on the project list could be done more expeditiously.

Eric Loomis, SMART Operations Manager, described the list of Future Projects that would be done if SMART had additional funds (Slide 5), noting it would be the next Appendix B. SMART would use the list to look for ways to unlock additional funding from additional pots through HB2017.

Mr. Brashear reviewed the timeline for getting the project list through both the Planning Commission and City Council. (Slide 6) He noted the last time SMART was before the Commission, Commissioner Mesbah had requested information on mixed-use, transit oriented projects.

Ms. Hendrix provided a short PowerPoint presentation on transit oriented development (TOD), describing the objectives and benefits of TOD, highlighting three local TOD developments, and reviewing key factors regarding SMART's mixed use facility. She noted Metro's goal to enhance 2040 growth centers and she believed that Town Center had been identified as one, so getting the bike/pedestrian bridge going would be

good. Collaboration between Metro, Clackamas County, and affordable housing partners would be important for SMART's mixed use facility. A TOD contact manager at Metro mentioned that affordable housing projects were always full, had long wait lists, and had limited financial risks since they were subsidized.

Mr. Brashear noted the rendering on Slide 6 showed what the SMART facility could look like. Only the building shown in the forefront currently existed. Since his last Commission meeting, a major developer in the area had expressed interest in a 99-year lease on the property and indicated he would develop it tomorrow. He believed that ultimately, it made good sense, but it would be down the road.

- He confirmed the next step was a public hearing with the Planning Commission on September 12th.

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

- Affordable housing projects were tough to manage and operate. People were willing to build them because the incentives and subsidies were there, but long term, they were problematic because it was difficult to keep them sustainable over time.
- Concerns about ridership were discussed at the last Commission meeting as well as the need to ensure that the things Wilsonville was planning for would have a tight focus on increasing ridership. Ridership was not improving at a large level. Wilsonville needed to be looking at how to fundamentally improve ridership in the long run by considering alternative solutions that might work two years from now and 20 years from now and not on the existing transit methodology. Including how each of the projects in the plan would improve ridership or not was a key component to making sure taxpayer dollars were being spent well.
 - Mr. Brashear noted SMART recently showed an increase in ridership year over year for July. Many things drove ridership and some things were within SMART's control, while other things were not. SMART worked on the things they could control, such as starting to advertise, and then managed the other things the best they could.
 - He would like to see all of the busses full all the time, but even in offering a free product, some people choose to drive their car across town. For a city the size of Wilsonville, the system was pretty robust. West Linn and other cities were envious of Wilsonville. He would meet with West Linn, Beaverton, and Hillsboro because they wanted to know how to create what SMART had created in Wilsonville. Ridership would always be something SMART would be driven to increase.
 - Where available, numbers should be used as a basis for decision making. In the absence of numbers, the City should at least be looking at how each project was expected to improve ridership. If a project on the list would not really improve ridership, something else should be found.
 - Mr. Loomis added that through HB2017, each agency would be held accountable to numbers with the understanding that they could be relative based on several factors. For instance, SMART had a more suburban area with a more spread out population, which would be different from TriMet downtown. SMART was looking at those numbers, which would be included in the application to TriMet to show what performance measures were planned. If those measures were not met over the span of this plan, it might be revisited for the next plan to change or add a route that would come to fruition a little better.
- The performance measures SMART had planned for the different projects did not necessarily have to be part of the plan, but a presentation that talked through what the plan was would provide some backup to justify why the Commission made the decisions it did.
 - Mr. Brashear noted it was a chicken and egg situation because he had found that usually frequency of service increased ridership. High frequency service was anything that operated every 15 minutes or less, so, people standing at a bus stop would not have to wait more than 15 minutes. It would be very expensive for SMART to run all of its service every 15 minutes. He noted SMART was the second largest recipient of HB2017 funds in the tri-county area behind TriMet.
- An express route from Wilsonville to Portland was at the top of the list, but it would be very expensive. Preliminary planning and hourly service all day would be about \$1 million a year. SMART was currently considering TriMet's Line 96 that went from Tualatin as an express to downtown. Rather than mirror that service, SMART would make higher frequency connections to Tualatin, which would be much more cost

effective for SMART. If that service was offered at a discount or free, customers would be paying one fair versus two, but they would have to make a transfer. Their goal was to work with TriMet to make the connections smooth and cut costs.

- An update was requested on how Basalt Creek would work with TriMet.
 - Mr. Brashear stated the Mayor and TriMet General Manager Doug Kelsey agreed that Mr. Brashear and Mr. Kelsey would sit down after SMART drafted a position paper. The paper would not be a legal argument, but just SMART's position on investing in Basalt Creek and what SMART expected from a transportation standpoint. SMART would be expected to provide service for Basalt Creek. TriMet had no interest in Frog Pond, Coffee Creek, or Basalt Creek, but it did have interest in collecting that revenue. SMART planned to make a very strong argument, and the matter could get interesting soon.
 - SMART's project list was scalable, so more of something could be done and less of something else if customers wanted, especially if it increased ridership. Currently, because it was so new, ODOT was being very flexible with the funding. SMART was depending on TriMet to meet the deadline because if the deadline was missed for any reason, SMART could not submit its application. He was doing everything possible to ensure the deadline was met.

VII. INFORMATIONAL

A. City Council Action Minutes (July 2, 2018 and July 16, 2018)

Chair Greenfield noted City Council had adopted the Basalt Creek Concept Plan.

B. 2018 Planning Commission Work Program

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Manager, confirmed that Boones Ferry Park would be revisited in October because September would include a public hearing on the SMART Program Enhancement Strategy and two work sessions, one on signage and wayfinding, and one on density inconsistencies.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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