



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2019

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- B. Consideration of the January 9, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2019
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Draft PC Minutes to be
reviewed for approval at the
2/13/2019 PC Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Jerry Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Those present:

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

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kimberly Rybold, and Jordan Vance

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Consideration of the December 12, 2018 Planning Commission minutes
The December 12, 2018 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. WORK SESSIONS

A. Town Center Plan (Bateschell/Rybold)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Manager, said she was excited to be presenting a draft of the entire Town Center Plan after two and a half years of work. While a few new maps and images had been added, everything in the document had been previously presented to the Commission. Using a slideshow on project's website, www.wilsonvilletowncenter.com, she briefly highlighted the Town Center Plan's background and key elements. The slideshow was created to provide a sense of what the community's input had created and to understand the Plan's key elements and how they were shaped by the community. At the end of the presentation, people could submit comments, which would provide more input going into the hearing process. The entire Town Center Plan would be posted to the site later this week. A tremendous amount of outreach had been done and the project team was grateful for all the valuable community input, and it was important to go back and share with them the value that they had provided, so the quick, easily scannable presentation was created for the public to access.

Molly Cooney-Mesker, MIG Consulting, thanked the Planning Commission, many of whom attended several community outreach events. She presented the Draft Town Center Plan via PowerPoint, highlighting the community outreach and input received, which informed the Plan's goals and vision, proposed land use, transportation, and infrastructure, as well as strategies for implementing the Plan.

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

- Table 3.1 on Page 31 of the Town Center Plan was connected to the Plan view diagrams regarding the phasing. It was uncertain when any given property would develop or what would be developed on any site. The project team looked at current land availability and the more feasible types of development in the Development Feasibility Report, and projected those building types in those places first.
 - The market analysis showed that office space was not as strong right now, although office was expected as the area developed and some of the mixed-use development came on line. When looking at the different sites, the team merged those uses together so different development types could be placed on those properties. The property owners could also sell a site 5 or 10 years earlier or later, or put a different building type on the site. With what was currently on the property and the likelihood of the use shifting, matching up the market and development analyses was the best the project team could do at this time. While one version of the analysis, it was the best guess that could be made given the situation.
- Transparency in government was important, and the project team was commended for making the Town Center Plan accessible for the layperson to read and understand. The implementation maps were helpful in visualizing what Town Center would look like in the future.
- On Figure 3.8 on Page 39 of the Town Center Plan, the Plan should make clear the location of the Korean War Memorial, which was critically important to people in the community, was not being encroached upon.
 - The green belt in the upper left quadrant of Figure 3.8 appeared to be a walkway, and needed to be more prominently shown as an open-space promenade, especially considering the intent was to connect the pedestrian bridge to Town Center Park.
 - The promenade cross-section depicted on Page 66 of the Plan illustrated what the promenade could potentially look like.
- The infrastructure, particularly the stormwater, seemed to be cost prohibitive.
 - Infrastructure cost estimates had not been done for the stormwater lines the private side of the development would put in. The majority of the stormwater lines were on local roads, so it was about getting the connections back to the mains. That analysis to determine if that infrastructure would be prohibitive or not was a recommended action item of the Town Center Plan.
 - On site stormwater quality and management and the requirement to connect to the main lines were consistent with the City's existing policies regarding infrastructure development. Based on the Code's requirements, the public cost of installing the lines was fairly minimal, but one recommendation in the economic development section was to determine if infrastructure would be cost prohibitive on the private side, and what funding strategies could be considered to address that.
- Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) and the evaluation of tax incentives were all programs that were allowed to be put in place at the local level in the State of Oregon.
 - The Mixed-use Tax Incentive, known as the Vertical Development Housing Zone, was a State-enabled program, but all the authority rested with the local government. The incentive has been used in a number of cities in the Portland region, and could be explored as an opportunity, particularly to focus on the Main Street. The incentive, which was only a partial tax abatement, could be put in place for a certain timeframe to get a few projects in the door. It would not need to be kept long-term. The recommendation was to do some analysis to determine the potential abatement, how long would it last, how much area was involved, and the time frame, such as for a year or the length of project.
 - Local and business improvement districts were both tools used within the Portland region and were set up at varying levels, often not by the local government. The LID could be done in partnership. Such districts were often self-imposed by a business district who wanted to pitch in a certain amount of money to get a unified benefit. With LIDs specifically tied to infrastructure, all property owners within the area would essentially self-impose a fee to pay for that infrastructure. The Plan described each of those tools. While many answers were uncertain, tools were available.
- The promenade cross-section depicted on Page 66 of the Plan illustrated what the promenade could potentially look like in cross section view.

- Nothing specifically noted who would be responsible for building the infrastructure; it looked like a private/public partnership. Typically, the developer builds the infrastructure; however, the City had not done that 100 percent of the time.
 - The map showed replacing a large stormwater pipe running diagonally through Town Center with the streets and the stormwater associated with the streets to redirect the run-off to the southeast corner of the Town Center and into the stream and Memorial Park. This made sense from an engineering and planning standpoint. From a cost perspective, this could affect the phasing of the development of some of the sites.
 - One concern was that the new sewer lines go with the roads, but some development might precede the roads. Town Center might need to be phased according to gravity, which could be challenging.
 - The same approach could be seen with the transportation network. At some point, the City might have to step in, saying the upstream area was getting developed, and do the street network in order to have a connector to the existing pipe until development filled in downstream. The analysis showed connectivity and existing flows would be accommodated. The detailed assumptions on the infrastructure were appreciated, as they were not wishful thinking assumptions. The City should be looking at this as a worst case scenario due to the uncertainty involved.
 - When installing new stormwater lines, the City could zigzag around existing buildings with future roads in mind, so when the road was built, the pipe was there. That funding would be aided from the downstream development as it occurred later on; typically, the infrastructure was done for them, but they paid for it later. The detailed analysis addressed the fact that all of this would be dependent on the elevation of the pipes' inverts. The capacity was there, it would just need to go downhill, which the engineers would ensure.
- The Emerald Chain idea was important and exemplified what everyone wanted in terms of an open space, connection to nature, and the environment. The promenade and pedestrian bike overpass would be a catalyst in communicating the Emerald Chain/new Town Center in a tangible way. Developing the promenade and gateway project at the bridge landing sooner should be considered. Those two elements would bring people into the area, which would be a destination for pedestrians.
- No accessible bike parking currently existed in Town Center. It would be great to be able to ride a bike from any neighborhood in the city, park at a centralized location in Town Center, and then walk to visit retail. That was the image the community wanted.
 - Currently, there was no easy bike access into this area without crossing major highways.
 - Fortunately, bicycle parking could be done with minimal infrastructure and expense.
- The project team had not formalized who would be the lead for creating a programming plan to activate year-round events.
 - Currently, multiple names were listed in the implementation matrix table, probably because a number of entities already did a lot of programming. Parks would be the first consideration on that, as they already did a tremendous amount of programming in Town Center. The new arts and cultural group would be a great group to coordinate with if it continued. A lot of opportunities exist for partnerships with a number of groups throughout the city that were already hosting events in Town Center.
 - As outlined in the implementation item, many downtown business groups or associations often take the lead on a programming plan, especially if a Business Improvement District was set up where they were all contributing and events throughout the year help promote that area.
- With regard to funding or grants to make Opportunity Zone Funds a reality, a recent federal-level bill might provide some potential funds for the City of Portland. Wilsonville was in an opportunity zone, so the City would be watching and tracking to see if funds were available to invest in Town Center projects. Economic Development Manager Jordan Vance recently attended a meeting on Opportunity Zones and would be working with Staff to help promote, to potentially get funding, or to make the right connections to bring projects to the area.
 - The whole idea was to get that catalyst for Town Center businesses to want to do Plan, which would require someone to be actively working that.

- Building Public-Private Partnerships was a prioritized action item and would explore how the City could find property owners, potential developers, and Opportunity Zone funds to bring those connections and projects together through economic development.
- The promenade idea was really interesting. One challenge for the City was that this was a long-range vision and plan and it needed to maintain enthusiasm for the Plan and keep the vision alive.
 - The Emerald Chain could be a short-term project, since it would not go through anyone's building, and provided a walking path designated on a map. Information placards could be placed every 300 yards or so to visually communicate the vision the City had for the profile in that area for plazas and activities. The placards would keep the idea alive for people biking or walking through and give them something to look forward to.
 - A 3-D fly-through video would be a good idea to show the ultimate vision of the promenade with the glazing, massing, vistas, etc. as the spatial articulation as one walked through the fully developed Town Center.
 - Clackamas County had a Main Street program with grants to do such 3-D flyover projects. Although normally for a block or a project site, they might be open to doing the promenade, which was only a few blocks long, or perhaps, the entire Emerald Chain, rather than just the street piece. It was something the Team could look into.
 - A 3-D video might encourage investing. The Plan was difficult to wrap one's head around. People were excited, but 10 or 20 years was a long time. Things like the video and placards would reinforce all the work, and what the people wanted and could spur investment interests. Keeping the picture in people's minds was important, as it could be easily lost with so many other things going on.
- The Bike-Ped Bridge was the top priority project for Infrastructure Investments (Table 5.1 Implementation Matrix); however not a lot of bicycle facilities exist on the west side of the bike-pedestrian bridge for the bridge to be useful.
 - The Bike-Ped Bridge project was waiting for the Town Center Plan to be done in order to begin design work for both the east and west side landings, as well as the bridge itself. That work would include looking at how the west side landing would connect to existing infrastructure. The connection from Boones Ferry Rd to Barber St would definitely be needed as part of the bridge project.
 - Without any real connection between the bike-ped bridge and Park Place with its improvements (Infrastructure Projects IN.2, IN.3, and IN.4 on Slide 28), the bridge would be useless.
- Bike-ped Project IN.11 and the promenade would be the natural connection from the bridge to Park Place, but it might not be built for another 10 years.
 - The team could consider modifications on ~~the~~ Town Center Loop W to add additional bike facilities in the interim, or create some other type of interim connection in that timeframe so people have a safe access point to get into the rest of Town Center.
 - The promenade was listed at Priority #12, but the projects were not listed in the order they would be phased; the projects were more clustered together. For example, Infrastructure Project 14, which included water, sewer, and stormwater, would happen as other developments and road projects occur. City Staff would look at how those could be integrated with private development. If the promenade was a higher priority, the project might be more publicly led if development in that area took too long.
- The connections needed to be in place to encourage people to come from the bike/pedestrian bridge to Town Center Park and the central Town Center area. Using Town Center Lp W to access existing connections was not as conducive for those traveling there on a regular basis.
 - The TBD estimated cost for the Promenade (IN.12) was partly because the initial thought was that it might be built as part of development. The team wanted to make sure the promenade was very embedded and well-designed with the surrounding development and land use. The project team did an at cost estimate for building the Promenade as part of the City's park system. That estimate could be put into the park system so SDCs could be collected to build it. The City did have that

avenue as an opportunity. The City might be interested in doing that, depending on the development pattern built out in Town Center in the next 10 years. The language would be added to the Plan.

- Thus far, Ms. Bateschell had been the point person described on Page 96 of 107. The City needed to identify someone with more focused responsibility on the coordination, planning, and resources for the Town Center development to fill that role, especially with Planning Staff already overburdened. That person would take the vision that had been developed with broad, diffused input from the community and provide the implementation to make it happen. It should be someone with a foot in the business community to not just let inspiration happen, but to cause it to happen in the business community. There was a need to excite investors to get the ball rolling.
 - The project team was not actively working to find the point person or agency, since it was an Implementation Action from the Plan. As an economic development strategy, Staff would be looking at a partnership between the City's economic development manager and the Planning Division to work together on how to implement some of the actions. That would also depend on the direction received through the adoption process, the priorities the City and City Staff should be working on, and the work goals set for Staff. Staff was looking for direction on whether finding that point person or agency would be an area of focus for the Community Development Department to be working on as part of its work program.
- The Chamber of Commerce had participated throughout the planning process. Chamber representatives were on the Task Force, and the project team hosted a number of events with the Chamber, targeting the business community. As the economic development strategies had come together, Staff met with Mr. Ferrasci O'Malley from the Chamber, and he had talked to the Chamber's board about the different strategies and which ones would be essential. The Chamber was called out as a partner the City would be collaborating with on Town Center. The question was whether the Chamber had the organizational structure for a Town Center business coalition, or was that something that would be led by Town Center businesses. It was unknown at this point. Some Town Center businesses believed it would be beneficial for them to be able to coalesce and work together.
 - There was already an existing structure through the Chamber, but more dialogue would be necessary with those different parties to determine the best structure. Although the City would be coordinating with the Chamber, it might not be the lead. The Chamber would be participating, but the specific structure was not clear yet.
 - No structure was emerging yet among the Town Center businesses. In the focus groups that included many Town Center businesses, there was a lot of excitement about this idea, but no one had taken the lead. Small business groups came together at different points in the project to talk about their questions and concerns; however no person or group had consistently said they wanted to be charged with setting it up or actively working on the project. It had been established more as a need rather than people self-identifying to take that action.
 - Commissioner Postma confirmed the Chamber had been very engaged, working with Ms. Bateschell and Mr. Vance quite frequently. The subject had been a topic of conversation at each monthly Chamber Board meeting. Various members and Board members participated on the Task Force.
 - The Chamber had the same problem as the City; how to pay for a point person. It was probably going to be a combination of City, Chamber, and some business people in this particular area coming together to take on this multi-tiered task.
- The need for transportation management would come with more business and commercial development, more local streets, and the need to manage parking. It would depend on development and demand, but probably in the 5 to 10 year timeframe, depending on parking demand. The project team recommended doing the Town Center Parking Management Plan around the 5 to 10 year timeframe, depending on the speed of redevelopment. That would help the City better understand when transportation management organization would come into play. If the businesses were working together or wanted to be proactive about certain areas, they might be interested in implementing it earlier.

- The Transportation Management Assessments (TMAs) in some communities help with transportation options, such as bike shares, shuttle services, or subsidizing Lifts. TMA's had many tools at their disposal, and could take many roles and use many strategies depending on the need and interest of the businesses.
- There was a parallel between the Main Street Program throughout the country, and what the City was trying to emulate here. The Economic Development Strategy recommended looking into whether Oregon's Main Street Program was an appropriate designation to go after, and if that program could provide additional support and direction to move some of this Plan forward.
 - The City could use that organization structure for how to address coordination in Town Center, which was much bigger than a typical main street, but large main streets as districts had used that model successfully.
 - A footnote on Page 90 of 107 stated the funds would be available for the Main Street Program in Spring 2019; however, since the Town Center Plan would be adopted in the spring, staff would look into the application timeframe to see if it was appropriate, and if the Planning Commission and City Council were interested in getting more information to see if that was too soon.
- High priority should be given both to the Emerald Chain, as a visible manifestation of the overall high-level plan, and to the development of Main Street, which should be the place maker for the entire Town Center development.
 - The Emerald Chain from the bike-pedestrian bridge over to Memorial Park, and the development of those few blocks at the heart of Main Street, would be very important to selling the Plan in the long-range, when people would not have to imagine it, and in the short-term, the Main Street development in particular ought to be where the City could get the most interest in smaller scale development; though a huge developer would be wonderful. In the short-term, having that perfect two or three-block part would express what the City had in mind for the entire area. It would be important to get that going with as much City support as possible.

Ms. Bateschell acknowledged meeting audience Ms. Meyers, Mr. Altman, and Mr. Spence, who all participated on the Project Task Force, noting they had done an amazing job on the project. She invited them to share any comments.

Ben Altman, 29515 SW Serenity Way, stated this Town Center Plan had been a long time coming. When on the Planning Commission, he made an attempt to get a Master Plan in place in the late 1980's, and he was the only one, other than Harold Long on the Design Review Board, that had any interest in it. They had some workshops and got people talking about. The process at that time was driven by the property owners and developers, and they were trying to hang on to what was at that time, a very vague Town Center Plan, which was essentially a colored map. Since then, Town Center was implemented through the Code, and that general master plan. While it was disappointing to him at that time, the community now saw what was missing, and through this process, developed a vision of what could be. The Commission had a really good start to reestablish that. He agreed the key was organizing the leadership process to deliver and keep the vision alive, which would be a challenge. There would be no energy if the Plan was just embedded in the Code as an adopted plan with some Code Amendments. He agreed with the priorities of creating the green link or Emerald Chain, and then realigning Park Place, which was a critical element to reorient the focus of the Town Center and begin to establish a real Main Street connection. In the 1990's, there was an effort by Payless and Albertsons to do a similar realignment, but due to the existing plan and Town Center Loop just having been built, there was no energy to change it. He had always believed realigning that was a missing link to get more of a north-south, center main street going through Town Center. The more that could be done early on to create the image, and hold onto it, the more the City would be able to deliver in the long run. He was very pleased with the Town Center Plan so far.

Chair Postma noted this Town Center Plan would become a bit of a marketing tool of sorts. He asked if Mr. Altman saw anything in the Plan that would be a disincentive or cause concerns.

- Mr. Altman replied he did not see anything alarming as he had more of a long-range planning focus. The key element that would be a challenge would be to work with the existing businesses to get them fully engaged in that they would not be destroyed with this Plan. There was still some question about how the businesses fit into the Plan in the long run. This would become even more important when realigning the road, especially for those that face the loop road. How the City packaged that leadership piece would be a key element. One way to get the organizational aspect started would be to identify a couple businesses that have an interest and would benefit from the realignment, even in terms of a relocation of their business. That might be a way to get the champion the City was looking for. The Chamber had been very active throughout this process, and at one time, having a subcommittee of the Chamber from Town Center business people had been discussed, similar to the industrial sector group.

Susan Meyers, Capital Realty and Task Force member, commended the City for taking this on and coming up with a wonderful plan. Years ago, Capital Realty bought farm-land, developed the shopping center and then sold to Fry's Electronics and Regal Wilsonville Stadium 9 theatre. Capital Realty currently owned only the three-story office building at the corner of Parkway and Town Center Loop. When Capital Realty started construction in the 1990s, it was dealing with a plan devised in the 1970s and 1980s. The company built for the town and demographic that existed at that time, which has changed substantially. The proposed Town Center Plan looked to the future, which was a smart thing to do, because if the City did not plan for the future, it would be left with whatever the market was driven towards, and without something to aspire to, that vision would never be achieved. The Plan might scare some business owners currently in the Town Center, thinking the buildings might be demolished and how the Plan might affect them in the future. When the landowners want to redevelop, this Plan would drive the direction. There might be some opportunity for some outside parties to do some major investment and redevelopment of the Town Center, and without the Plan in place, the City would get a lesser product. She appreciated all the hard work from Staff and the volunteer citizens.

Commissioner Mesbah:

- Noted that without a vision, results from outside developers would be uncertain. He asked if a visionary plan would attract the kind of developer-investor wanting to develop that higher type of product, as opposed to run-of-the-mill. Would having a visionary plan make Town Center more attractive to investors?
 - Ms. Meyers believed adopting a visionary plan was part of it, along with the City actually pursuing high-end investors that have the money and willingness to invest significant dollars to create a sense of place. Bridgeport was one example; though Town Center would be something different. Having that kind of visioning to create a sense of place could be done in Town Center, which would take the City going after a high-end partner. She cautioned the City from doing that until some of this planning tool was in place as a bigger picture, so it would be a more coordinated effort.
- Cited a BMW advertisement that noted the difficulty of predicting the future, so they decided to create it. The City needed to have the same approach, otherwise the future would be just whatever happened, rather than having a preference for what was desired.

Ms. Cooney-Mesker continued the PowerPoint presentation, noting the two outstanding issues regarding the maximum building floor plate and drive-throughs in Town Center and reviewing the project team's proposed options for the Commission's consideration on Slides 42 and 43.

Key comments and discussion points regarding the outstanding issues were as follows:

Floor Plate Options (Slide 43):

- The potential increase up to 50,000 sq ft, whether per floor or single story, was provided because the project team looked at what different industries were doing and the types of uses that might locate in Town Center. Based on the Commission's discussion regarding grocery stores, local gyms, etc., most were less than 30,000 sq ft. Some in the grocery store category and gym uses were larger than 30,000 sq ft. Most of the uses that exceeded 30,000 sq ft were in the 40,000 to 50,000 range, unless it was a large user like Sam's or Costco, which was not called for in Town Center. Option 1 would maintain the 30,000 sq

ft, which allowed for most of the uses. Option 2 provided more flexibility for larger users, but maintained the multi-story building. Grocery stores at 40,000 to 50,000 sq ft still had to comply with the high-scale design standards. If the Commission wanted to allow up to 50,000 sq ft, they needed to determine if single-story buildings should be allowed where 50,000 sq ft buildings were allowed, or should the two-story requirement be maintained.

- The examples presented in the PowerPoint were specific to locations in the Portland metro region. National trends regarding floor plates of approximately 50,000 sq ft showed very broad variations even within stores like Target or Whole Foods, but no details were provided about where stores were located or the sizes of the populations they served.
- Discussion regarding whether Wilsonville was big enough for anchor stores like Target, and how the floor plate area requirements would attract and encourage certain types of uses and businesses. Key comments included:
 - The Commission and community had discussed the Town Center being more of a local town center as opposed to people coming from Portland to shop.
 - People south of the river frequently went to Costco and Target, and people 50 miles away came to Fry's and Camping World. Although, it did create a parking necessity not wanted for Town Center. Fry's brought a lot of people to the area, who then patronize other businesses in the region, which should not be limited.
 - The biggest concern was the City might be underserved in the grocery-type area, and they still needed a footprint.
 - Taking away a regional draw might be okay if Fry's was not going to be there someday, but local mom-and-pop clothing stores on the Main Street would still need people to come from places outside Wilsonville to survive.
 - Anchor was usually associated with some regional, national chain, but a grocery-type business would be needed, especially with more housing being added in Town Center, and it could draw the people needed to patronize smaller businesses. Small, locally-owned businesses were necessary, but they would still need a draw.
 - Mr. Gibbs, retail expert, had referenced a split between local, regional, and national-type industries and chains. A number of national chains were looked at and two issues were at play:
 - First, the different levels of retail, including national chains, were providing uses envisioned for Town Center at well below 30,000 sq ft, so national, regional, and local retail experiences could still be achieved.
 - Second, involved building form. A multi-story grocery stands out, and was probably less achievable in a market like Wilsonville within the 10 to 20 year timeframe. The existing grocery store in Town Center had a building footprint that was unlikely to change in the next 15 years. Was a multi-story building feasible for that use, or did the Commission want to allow a larger square footage to allow grocery stores like Whole Foods, which were under 30,000 or 40,000 sq ft?
- Limiting the floor plate to 30,000 sq ft could create a situation where Fry's would be a prize. Walmart could easily move in if Fry's went out of business, which could become an incentive for not redeveloping that old property. Essentially, a 100,000 sq ft building would be grandfathered in, and no one else would be able to build that. It could become a commodity, similar to drive-throughs in Portland.
 - The city should not be held hostage for what currently existed. The solution could be Option X. However, it could be an invitation to challenging the standards, and the results would depend on who sat on the Development Review Board (DRB) and who was on Staff at the time. During recessions, any kind of hare-brained development idea became prized when development was needed, which would be very dispiriting considering the vision for Town Center.
- No matter which option the Commission chose, there was always the potential of getting a waiver.
 - It was important to have something in the Plan about larger stores being a possibility; otherwise mom-and-pop businesses would be scared to invest on Main Street because they needed traffic in order to

invest. Small businesses needed to know it was a viable option without leaving the door so wide-open the City ends up with something it did not want.

- Parking was more of a concern than store footprint, since multiple stories could be added and smaller storefronts could front the street with larger stores behind them.
- Developers should propose creative, innovative projects that were beneficial to all concerned. The issue was getting the Code to achieve that.
- The Commission did not want to exclude innovative ideas. Option 2, along with some language from Option X, would allow the developer to propose different ideas in keeping with the Town Center vision. Option 2 addressed more of the initial vision, whereas Option 3 moved away from that.
 - Creating a list of items to make a project more active, pedestrian friendly, etc. was suggested, much of which had already been done with Form-based Code, so there was already precedent. Developing the list of indicators would be a little tricky.
- Taking a harder stance on footprint rather than on maximum floor space was favored because with the pressure of parking and traffic, going up added considerable mass to the business space without increasing the crowding of the acreage, which was very important. Even with more expansive building on the periphery, having a huge footprint together with a huge parking lot was a waste of space. A smaller footprint, more floor space above, and parking underneath was desirable. A small-town feel should be maintained for Main Street. With online options, a big floor print was not necessary to have a large business, which was what the City was trying to attract. Option 2 was preferred.
- Option 2 added flexibility without moving too far away from the vision developed for Town Center. Whether a waiver process was needed to allow something special was the uncertainty.
 - If the intent and vision were made clear in the Plan, there would be a basis for judging applications for exceptions that did not stray too far from the vision.
 - Maintaining the look and feel, especially in Main Street (MS) district was especially important. As discussed at the last meeting, Main Street frontage for large buildings should be limited so smaller and larger businesses would together, preventing a giant block of New Seasons, for example, and losing out on that frontage which would draw traffic. This should be addressed in the Code. This would allow larger uses without taking away from the vision of the MS district.
 - Including Neighborhood Mixed Use (N-MU) in Option 2 did not seem to fit the definition or placement of what had been discussed for the N-MU category. Having “the per floor” ability on the MU and Commercial Mixed Use (C-MU) was favored; 30,000 sq ft per use for MS and N-MU, and then 30,000 sq ft per floor for MU and C-MU.
- Upon reviewing pictures of other building sizes, a 30,000 sq ft building might not fit in the N-MU. Crate and Barrel, which was 20,000 sq ft per floor would not fit, but possibly a neighborhood Whole Foods type of design, though whether the Town Center could support such a facility was difficult to say.

Ms. Bateschell summarized the Planning Commission’s direction thus far and provided comments as follows:

- Several Commissioners were comfortable with Option 2.
 - Because the idea was to have things quieter in the N-MU, it might not be appropriate to expand the per floor requirement in that district, but maintain the square footage per use requirement. The MS and N-MU would have 30,000 sq ft per use, and MU and C-MU would have 30,000 sq ft per floor.
 - Half of the Commission was open to the potential to exceed the 30,000 sq ft per floor in the MU and C-MU if additional criteria were met. The project team would draft some indicators of success that were in line with the Town Center vision and goals. A menu-based approach would likely be used, where a developer would have to meet a certain number of elements to be granted a waiver.
 - Design guidelines already exist in the Development Code, with frontage, setback, pedestrian orientation and articulation requirements. The menu-based approach would allow extra community benefits in a project should a waiver to exceed the square footage be granted.

Discussion continued as follows:

- In addition to aesthetics, the criteria or items a developer could choose from in order to be granted a waivers should include functional public spaces, public services, meeting space, performance space, outdoor seating and other elements that add to the success of Town Center. What was being presented on the street was another big consideration to avoid having a full block of one building. The façade should be broken up with other smaller stores along the street frontage.
- Clear and objective criteria were needed regarding the maximum floor plate to provide a benchmark or parameter as guidance for Staff and the DRB to consider. No parameters meant anything could be proposed.
 - The maximum could be attached to the block and a certain coverage amount.
 - Blocks in Portland, which was known for its walkability, were 200 sq ft by 200 sq ft, a 40,000 sq ft block. The old Meier & Frank building was one of the few that still took up all four corners of a block, and that building was vastly out of scale for Wilsonville.
 - If the building was designed to be more than just a box, with an entrance on more than one street, and a multitude of things happening in between, the scale or square footage could be achieved without having it look that big.
 - The City should not stifle the creativity of businesses that could make use of the space. Fry's could be redeveloped into something amazing and not just a box.
 - Based upon the proposed street layout, the largest block standard was 250 ft by 250 ft, so the building could not be any larger than that. The City's block standards would constrain the maximum floor plate allowed.

Ms. Bateschell confirmed the Planning Commission's direction regarding floor plates was as follows:

- With Option 2 as the primary driver, Option 1.5 was 30,000 sq ft per use for MS and N-MU and 30,000 sq ft per floor for MU and C-MU. And, Option X would allow a waiver process to exceed the maximum square footage per floor in the MU and C-MU process.
- There would not be a maximum square footage but to get a waiver, the applicant would have to prove the proposal met the intent of the vision and achieved some of the performance standards from the menu of success indicators.

Additional comments included:

- Given the existing empty spaces in malls, not having a maximum size was fine if the applicant could provide an analysis showing the proposal was viable, and good for the city and Town Center. The block size would limit building sizes anyway, which was comforting.
 - While all local streets were depicted on the map, the street map was not official. Because larger parcels in Town Center might get broken up and developed over time, the project team wanted to allow some flexibility for how the streets would be aligned. The Code stated projects must be consistent with the proposed street network. If modifications were proposed, the project would need to meet criteria and receive approval from the DRB. Spacing standards would still have to be met, but the road did not have to go exactly as shown on the map. The map was based on the spacing standards, but the roads could potentially shift for development.
 - At one point, the Commission discussed having a slightly larger spacing between two roads as long as pedestrian access was maintained at the 250 ft space interval. There would still be maximum spacing standards, but some streets might be bike-ped only and not a vehicular road.

Staff would move forward with Option 2 with the amendment for 30,000 sq ft per use for MS and N-MU and provide a menu-based approach for a waiver process.

Drive through Options (Slide 44):

- Drive-throughs were more appropriate on the Loop segments rather than Wilsonville Rd or within the interior of Town Center. In November, the Commission discussed having drive-throughs only in the two MU districts along Wilsonville Rd, but not in the northern MU area.

- With too much constriction, like in Options 1 and 2, grandfathered drive-throughs would never go away, which was the market being created in Portland with its new drive through standards. Existing drive-throughs in Portland were gold. The danger of being too restrictive was keeping drive-throughs where they were, which could be an impediment to what Wilsonville wanted to develop in Town Center.
 - A drive through option was still need in the MU, except in the northern quadrant due to traffic concerns, though queuing standards could help.
- The quantity of drive-throughs could be limited in Option 3 to a specific amount or spacing, so drive-throughs would still be allowed, but not too many in a row.
- Allowing transferrable rights for drive-throughs was suggested, which would prevent specific tax lots from being grandfathered and enable existing drive-throughs to potentially transfer into a higher use. As streets move during the redevelopment, businesses with existing drive-throughs could relocate within Town Center and might transfer to a higher use.
- Drive thoughts create a car-dependent characteristic and the idea was to make Town Center pedestrian friendly. Drive-throughs create hazards for bike trails and other elements.
- Drive-throughs could be a part of a redeveloped area, even in downtown pedestrian areas, if located in parking lots or at the back of the business, for example. Since vehicles did not exit the drive through at the same place as the parking lot, it did not cause an additional point of impact with bike and pedestrian paths, and the ambiance would not be as affected.
- There was a dissonance between a drive through and the pedestrian, walkable neighborhood and the lingering desired on the Main Street, currently Park Place. They were completely different types of activity. However, the radical changes in the business model, which was going toward online and online with pick-up, which would be facilitated with a drive through option
- The Commission agreed drive-throughs were not being advocated in the Main Street district or within the interior of Town Center, only in the MU districts on the Loop.
- Allowing drive-throughs in all MU districts was suggested. In the northern MU area, Town Center Lp E was a collector and Parkway Ave and Canyon Creek Rd were minor arterials, so why not allow a drive through in that area as well?
- A clear definition of drive through was needed before the Commission could determine how many was acceptable. Currently, banks, car washes, and Goodwill all had drive through facilities.
- Spacing requirements could be used to determine the number of drive-throughs allowed on the periphery, rather than an arbitrary number.
 - Concern was expressed about drive-throughs on the periphery along Town Center Lp E because included of the N-MU district and people living very close to the street.
 - Perhaps drive-throughs would not be allowed to enter/exit from Town Center Lp E, but from an interior circulation road. Pedestrians would be everywhere and drive-throughs had to be allowed somewhere. Defining drive-throughs might help; not every drive through was for 24-hour fast food.
- How the transferrable right would work for a different developer needed to be determined. Also, if a business eliminated a drive through, would they get a credit toward a waiver, such as to increase building height?
- After full development of Town Center, people would not likely want to drive there just to go thru a drive through, so future drive-throughs should be outside the Town Center area on high-traffic streets.
- Spacing or using existing driveways for drive-throughs to minimize impacts was suggested.
- The existing standards would help accomplish the ideas the Commission had discussed should a site redevelop.
 - Because Option 2 allowed drive-throughs to be rebuilt, standards for drive through facilities were included in Section K of Appendix A, which was available online. The standards excluded drive-throughs from the MS district; required traffic queuing on site; prohibited the traffic lane between the building and public street to maintain buildings fronting the street for the pedestrian experience; meeting standards for primary building access which was pedestrian oriented; and clearly marking drive-throughs to avoid conflict with pedestrian and bike facilities.

- Something could be added about the driveway access being the primary access point or being the access point for the drive through. Spacing could be a way to reduce conflicts by reducing the number of driveways and still achieve what was envisioned for Town Center.
- Setting a hard number for drive-throughs was not favorable and prohibiting new drive-throughs (Option 2) tied the City's hands. No one knew the direction business was going in the next 10 to 20 years, so the Code must be flexible.
- Maintaining pedestrian access and feel was critical, as well as encouraging people to get out of their cars, and yet recognize people would not always do that.
- The vision for Town Center needed to be considered in the approval process. Clear and objective standards were a real problem for creative development.
 - "Does not meet project Vision" in Option 3 was an issue, because it was possible to allow an increase in the number of drive-throughs while meeting the project vision, which should not be so limited as to specify how many drive-throughs were permitted, only that the drive-throughs were consistent with the overall use, ambiance, intent, and feel of the project.
- The Commission favored Option 3 with the modified language for spacing standards, or some sort of limiting factor.
 - Spacing standard currently existed for curb cuts, but not all would work as drive-throughs.
 - There was concern about the enforcement mechanism to ensure a drive through's internal queuing was sufficient to avoid spillover. On site enforcement would ensure drive-throughs were operating in an acceptable manner.
 - The Human Bean drive through was a contentious issue at the DRB. It had very limited, shared space with other businesses, and the applicant was required to provide a very detailed traffic analysis.
 - Looking at Portland's new standards was suggested, especially with regard to access details and projecting queuing to ensure drive lanes were appropriate. Portland's standards might help Staff address the Commission's concerns.
- With regard to the desired spacing standard, Staff would review the existing driveway standards to see what made sense as far as the number of curb cuts and pedestrian spacing standards.
- Performance standards around the queuing and any conflicts with pedestrians and bikes were requested.

Following the discussion, Ms. Bateschell offered to send an update via email regarding the number of driveways in Town Center; the potential to transfer drive through rights; current driveway spacing standards and Portland's new queuing and access design standards to see how Wilsonville might be able to be consistent. If further discussion was needed a short work session would be added to the February agenda.

- The project team intended to include the Commission's recommendations on the outstanding issues in the City Council packet or call them out during the presentation.

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. City Council Action Minutes (December 3 & 17, 2018)

Commissioner Springall asked about the discussion at the most recent City Council meeting about wireless standards.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, Assistant City Attorney, explained the new FCC ruling would go into effect January 14, 2019. On Monday, Council adopted design standards and fees, and also adopted on First Reading some Code amendments. Council would be adopting the Code Amendments on Second Reading on January 24, 2019, asking that it go into effect immediately.

A. 2019 Planning Commission Work Program

Chris Neamtzu, Community Development Director, clarified that the Small Wireless Facilities work session scheduled in February was a placeholder as Staff had anticipated a second round of Code revisions might be needed to fully comply with the FCC regulations. However, that second step had not materialized in the timeframe shown in the schedule. Through litigation and additional decisions made over time, revisiting the Code again might be necessary. Staff did not see the work session being necessary as proposed.

Chair Greenfield noted City Council had reappointed Commissioner Springall for another term. He also noted that next month, the Planning Commission was due to elect the Chair and Vice Chair for 2019.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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