

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 2016
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Minutes approved as
presented
January 18, 2017*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Al Levit, Phyllis Millan, and Simon Springall; Peter Hurley, Kamran Mesbah, and City Councilor and Charlotte Lehan were absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Miranda Bateschell, and Stephan Lashbrook

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN'S INPUT - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda.

There was none.

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, reported on behalf of Councilor Lehan, updating the Commission on two significant action items that took place at Monday's City Council meeting.

- In the work session, Council decided upon the City's new logo, which would be implemented in the New Year and branded appropriately. Council had undertaken another process, lasting about 14 months, to refine the logo. A number of artists presented at least 15 different choices and Council made revisions to the logo they preferred.
 - The selected City logo was a modern interpretation of the Hand-in-Hand with Nature theme of the current logo with a hand and seedling. The new logo was very scalable and had bright and vibrant colors with blues representing the river and the rain, green representing the trees and the land, and elements to reflect Wilsonville being a growing city. The artist had also told a story about that modern interpretation. He distributed a picture of the new logo.
- The second major action was the decision to connect the Brown Road Extension at 5th St because of better long-term suitability and stacking. Many of the engineering reasons behind the decision were based on the technical analysis.
 - A lot of testimony was provided on both sides of the issue. The neighborhood was not pleased and had significant concerns about the decision. It was a unanimous vote. Mayor Knapp stepped down from the dais and testified as a citizen, so the four remaining Councilors dealt with the final action. This was a fairly significant milestone decision considering the extension has been in the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) since 1991, the choices being either 5th St or Bailey St.
 - Chris confirmed the discussion included redoing the plan at 5th St and Boones Ferry Rd, noting a number of additional elements were added to the decision. As the design progresses and surveying occurs, there would be numerous outreach opportunities and stakeholder involvement touchpoints with the neighborhood regarding the mitigation measures at 30 percent, 70 percent and he believed at 90 percent design. There would be a lot of communication and collaboration moving forward to make that connection as suitable as possible.

Commissioner Springall said the Planning Commission had a few reservations about the 5th St Connection, which included parking and the limited right-of-way on the east side of Boones Ferry Rd due to the old buildings. Those details would still need to be worked out.

- Mr. Neamtzu replied the parking was addressed in the revisions that came before Council. The project team figured out how to maintain the parking on the 5th St segment adjacent to the existing buildings. He understood parking was not eliminated on the existing segment of 5th St.
- He noted Councilor Lehan had made specific comments about the significance and importance of the old buildings on Boones Ferry Rd. There was no intention to damage or hurt the buildings. In fact, he intended to promote something to enhance them, perhaps a façade enhancement or partnering with the property owner to do something to complement the extension project.
- He added it would be worth watching some of the Councilor's summary comments, which were incredibly thoughtful. The Councilors all articulated the rationale behind their decision-making and all had different reasons. He believed the Council made a tough decision, but had provided a lot of logic behind the decision that was made.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

A. Consideration of the November 9, 2016 Planning Commission minutes

Chair Greenfield corrected the last line of the seventh bullet on Page 3 to state, "...residential area was ~~unlikely~~ *likely* to occur since no I-5 onramp access existed."

The November 9, 2016 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as amended.

II. WORK SESSIONS

A. Town Center Plan Public Involvement (Bateschell)

Miranda Bateschell, Long-Range Planning Manager, briefly reviewed the context and background for the Town Center Plan project. The Town Center Plan was a goal set forth in both the Urban Renewal and Tourism Development Strategies, and it became one of City Council's goals in 2014. The City was awarded a \$320,000 grant from Metro at the end of 2015 for this project and established an intergovernmental grant (IGA) with Metro over the last year. The Town Center Plan contract was considered by City Council and awarded to MIG, Inc. in August 2016. The scope of work was refined and adopted in September.

- Since then, the project team has reviewed a lot of the history of Town Center and the City, in general. They toured the Town Center and adjacent areas and walked some of its segments to get a good feel of Town Center and learn what was working, where there might be challenges, and what was more easily accessible by car versus by foot.
- The project team was also gathering a lot of data to better understand the current infrastructure systems, traffic, Zoning Code, etc. to have a basis for the existing conditions work to follow and starting point for upcoming discussions with the public, Planning Commission and City Council.
- Much of the team's work thus far involved setting up the structure for the public engagement, which included creating the website and public involvement tools for the project, as well as developing the draft Public Engagement Plan. The Plan would act as a guide, laying out major events, as well as the different channels and times for the City's various communication methods.
- The intent of the Town Center Plan was to provide a community-driven vision for the Town Center and to establish clear actions toward achieving that vision. Therefore, the project team really tried to create a public engagement plan that was driven by the community.
- She briefly highlighted the extensive experience and professional background of MIG Consultant and Project Manager Alex Dupey, noting the City was excited to have his team and their experiences on this project.

Alex Dupey, Director of Planning Services, Consultant Project Manager, MIG, Inc, noted the draft Public Engagement and Communications Plan included in the meeting packet and developed with the City, was a

living document. Throughout the coming 18 months, the project team would be checking in with the Planning Commission, City Council, and the public at every stage of the process to evaluate what was and was not working and to consider the best and most effective ways to engage Wilsonville residents and businesses.

- MIG and City Staff worked together to create the logo for the project, which showed an active Town Center, the goal of the project, and a place for Wilsonville residents and businesses to come together and have a great space. The logo would become the brand for the project and be on all of the materials. Business cards with the logo, website, and a QR code were created for the project and the Commissioners were encouraged to hand them out as they talked with people about the project. The website would be continually updated throughout the project so everyone could access the current library of documents, list of next events, get updated about the current progress, and could learn how to provide input at a variety of scales. Though still pretty basic, the website was active now and would grow considerably as the project moved forward.

Mr. Dupey presented the Wilsonville Public Engagement Plan and Project Update via PowerPoint, outlining the goals and outcomes of the outreach process, as well as the methods and tools that might be utilized to gather input from Wilsonville citizens, businesses, and stakeholders about the redevelopment of Town Center.

Discussion and feedback from the Commission and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- It was important that meeting attendees receive feedback about how their comments and feedback were or were not being incorporated into the project. How would people know their input or feedback was valuable? Some of the negative feedback related to public engagement stemmed from participants not knowing what became of their comments. There was some sense that people were not heard at some of the meetings.
 - Mr. Dupey responded that every comment, whether written, on a survey, or used in a wall graphic, would all be logged as public input and become part of the record for the project, and each logged result, whether from a public meeting or part of a process would have a response. Not every comment would be put into an alternative, but the response would identify what was done. The team would also want to learn what did or did not resonate with the Planning Commission, City Council, and public, as well Staff. This one process of documentation would facilitate understanding about where things were going while also providing the Commission information so decisions could be made about what was bubbling up as a key issue or theme as the process progressed.
 - For those attending meetings or more engaged in the process, meeting summaries, including visuals and materials, would be sent to every committee member after each meeting and to anyone who signed up for updates via mail or email regarding the process. Whenever an email address was provided, they will get information until the recipient tells them not to send anything further.
 - Information and materials would always be on the website as well.
 - He assured the project team wanted to be as transparent as possible. If something was not working, the team wanted to hear about it. If the Commissioners heard something from their constituents, the team wanted to be sure to understand it.
 - Working to avoid such negative feeling was a great thing to think about this early in the process. As a living document, course corrections could be made as needed if things were not working midway through.
- The project team was encouraged to reach out to the Chamber of Commerce CEO. The Chamber holds biweekly, and sometimes three times a month, networking meetings at various business locations. The Chamber would be happy to partner in getting businesses together, but also provide the opportunity to gather information, not just from people inside Town Center, but other businesses outside Town Center.
 - Mr. Dupey confirmed MIG had done that in the past and it was really successful. Doing a quick project presentation at a meeting provided a quick way to get input.
- Given the business licenses and property owners who were targeted for outreach in the Town Center, Staff believed there were about 350 businesses and about 50 to 60 property owners.
- Redevelopment of Town Center was dependent on the property owners' initiative. Addressing issues related to property owners not wanting to redevelop might need to be worked on in the Plan. The City wanted to do engage property owners, bring them to the table, and hopefully work with them on a shared vision based on

input from the community, as well as the property owners and businesses. Some property owners might want to develop in the short-term and some mid- to long-term. The Plan would include a set of action items related to the vision so when people were ready to come online, the development would occur in accordance with that shared vision.

- Mr. Dupey added that further in the process, Leland Consulting Group and Bob Gibbs, a national retail expert, would work on some catalytic site analyses to consider what would be needed to redevelop sites where the property owners might be more willing or interested, or even sites that make a lot of sense to consider for redevelopment, such as vacant spaces. What types of uses that were in line with the vision the project might make sense? Tools within the process would help address questions about what it might take to develop or redevelop specific locations that are to be determined through the process.
- Because the project was still in the discovery phase, the project team had just started the process and was gathering information about everything that currently existed. No one was talking about what the vision might be or what that might mean as far as retaining the existing buildings and infrastructure or tearing everything down and starting over.
 - There were a lot of great businesses and great infrastructure in Town Center, and the team did not want to negatively impact that either, but to think about how to make what was working continue to work and improve what was not working. How that evolved and the viewpoint of that process would develop throughout the process.
 - There was an opportunity for more connectivity. The City could probably not start from scratch and build a whole new street grid might be done somewhere else, but there would probably be talk about making extra connections that would not impact existing businesses negatively or at least in the most minimal way possible. All of this was to be determined and discussed through the process.
 - Mr. Dupey added Town Center was a very active place with a lot of businesses and some great new buildings. Part of the process was to acknowledge what was already working in the area, but also consider what things truly make this the center of the community. That discussion would be part of the vision process starting in early 2017 with the public and community.
- Regarding the boundaries of the study area, the majority of the team's focus and work would be within the primary Town Center designation, which was in line with the City's Commercial PUD zoning, and included all the property inside Town Center Loop and those immediately adjacent on the opposite side of Town Center Loop.
 - The study area would also include what are called influence areas, basically the neighborhoods to the east, north and south of Town Center, as anything being done along Wilsonville Rd would impact both sides of the street. These influence areas were connected to and a part of how Town Center operates, but not part of the existing discrete zone.
- The Land Use Map with Circulation (Slide 3) was not a vision type of deliverable, but for a master plan. When would the Commission see the high-level plan as a deliverable to be discussed? Even with the constraints with the property owners, perhaps the City was not thinking big enough. Wilsonville's Town Center could be pretty major, and there should be agreement about what the vision was before getting into details like circulation.
 - Mr. Dupey clarified the Circulation and Land Use Maps would be outcomes of the vision and become implementation measures. The vision builds throughout the process, from the first public meeting in February to ask the community about the grand scheme and what Town Center should look like in 20 years. From that, a vision statement and some goals would start being developed for the project. The vision statement should be the guiding principle for the project and the City needed to talk to the community about what that vision looked like.
 - There was something great about Town Center and they needed to figure out how to take advantage of that. As alternatives and analyses progressed, the grand vision would be more fine-tuned as well as how to actually implement all the pieces in a realistic manner. That was where specific types of financing and projects would be considered, as well as the right level of land use that made sense for the City of Wilsonville.

- The first half of the project involved the visioning. The second half involved figuring out what made sense to actually implement those pieces in a specific manner so that as a city, there were phased, incremental steps that made sense to support businesses and residents to achieve the vision for Town Center that the community developed early on.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted the first public event to start the visioning process would be in February, and Task Force meetings would run parallel with that in February and March for more discussions. The high-level vision would come to the Planning Commission and City Council in April 2017 to talk about the vision and goals for the project, which would set the stage for discussing different ideas over the summer about design alternatives, land uses, scale, etc. through community workshops and other planned events, such as the idea centers. The first draft land use plan would probably be presented toward the end of 2017 for review and refinement, aiming at that as a deliverable in 2018. The goal was to solidify the high level vision in the spring and then work to see how it might unfold on the ground throughout the summer and fall of 2017.
 - Given Wilsonville's tremendous traffic problems, concerns were expressed about the impact traffic would have on planning for Town Center. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) would undoubtedly have something to say about any added traffic. Everyone needed to keep the City's traffic issues in mind throughout the entire planning process. While the vision for Town Center could be expansive, it was important to ensure it fit within the reality of what the City had to work with.
 - Mr. Dupey noted DKS Associates was on the team to evaluate traffic and, having done most of the traffic work within the city for many years, was well aware of the issues.
 - The vision elements that come through the public process to shape what Town Center would ultimately be would be looked at very closely to see not only how they affect traffic, but other infrastructure, like stormwater, sewer, water etc. as well. Discussions would consider what types of uses make sense, the traffic impacts, how they related to the community as a whole, and perhaps, a mix of land uses that could potentially reduce some trips. Big box commercial, for example, would have a huge traffic impact, while mixed-use would have a much different impact.
 - Being so close to the interchange, ODOT would certainly be part of the process.
- B. Frog Pond Area Plan (Neamtzu)

The following handout was entered into the record and distributed to the Planning Commission at the dais:

- One-page memorandum from Don Hanson, Otak, dated December 22, 2016 providing comments about the Residential Design Standards.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated Joe Dills would continue the conversation on the Frog Pond Master Plan by walking the Commission through the revised Code language and discussing some new Comprehensive Plan language as well as a new topic on gateways and monumentation. The project team has been working hard on the Code and collaboration with the City's development partners continued as the partners reviewed and provided feedback on the Code versions. He noted a handout had been distributed from Otak, representing West Hills Development.

- He announced that just this week, the school district determined that its 10-acre property fronting on Boeckman Rd in the Frog Pond West Neighborhood would be the site of a future primary school, which changed everything for the land plan, density calculations, and the revenue assumptions made to this point regarding the Infrastructure Financing Plan. Though frustrated by this decision coming at this point, he believed the primary school would add a tremendous asset to the West Neighborhood and result in a tremendously cohesive community.
 - Given the school district's decision, he and Mr. Dills would need to relook at the entire project as a lot of rework and remapping needed to be done. For example, the transportation network, which assumed housing on all 25 acres of the school district property, would have to be redone. There would need to be collaboration with the school district to ensure any adjustments to the transportation network were

acceptable and suited the district to accommodate a future school site, all of which would take time and resources.

- The previous schedule of Commission and Council work sessions and public hearings would have to be re-calendared over the next several months. He had targeted a public hearing in February, but it would need to be moved to March to allow time to collaborate with the school district done and also get the revisions to the City Council.
- Work had already begun on the revised street grid, and there had been communication with school district Director Tim Woodley about the concepts. A series of meetings was being set up to collaborate on text and the revisions, all of which would return to the Planning Commission for more review and feedback.

Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group (APG), noted the packet started with the updated draft Residential Neighborhood Code text and asked if the Commission had any questions about those revisions before he reviewed the Residential Design Standards, which began on Page 15 of 68.

Discussion and comments regarding the draft Residential Neighborhood Code text revisions were as follows:

- Section 4.127(.01)D (Page 3 of 68) included “cohesive neighborhoods”. Was all of Frog Pond the neighborhood or the subdivisions within?
 - The entire 180 acres was considered the Frog Pond Neighborhood. Any references to cohesion or “knitting together individual developments” referred to the entire neighborhood together.
- Section 4.127(.07)4 (Page 7 of 68) Concerns were expressed about the subjective language and the need for (.07)4 if variance provisions already existed in the Code.
 - Mr. Dills explained the intended review process was Plan Development Review (PDR) and that Code section was used as part of the model for this new zone. This type of language was actually found in several places in that part of the Code, so it just mirrored that as one style that was being done. The other part was on the open spaces, the project team realized they were not going to think of everything at this stage of code-writing. Developers would have good ideas that should be considered other than what had been proposed in this 4,000 sq ft standard.
 - The burden or authority was passed onto Development Review Board (DRB) in a number of areas. Words like ‘adequate’ were not defined and had no criteria. Section 4.127(.08)A (Page 8 of 68) stated “The purpose of these standards for the Neighborhood Zone is to provide adequate light, air, open space...” How was adequate to be understood or interpreted? Did any guidelines exist for what was adequate?
 - Mr. Dills responded no, not in this section. This was a discretionary review in which the discretion did lie with the DRB to make that particular judgment. Quite a bit of responsibility was on the DRB in this section because of the linkage to the PDR process and the language mirrored that type of authority and decision-making. In this instance, it was for when somebody asks for something that was different from what was more cut-and-dried in the Open Space Standard, such as for an idea that was not listed in explicit words in this particular set of standards.
 - The personality of the Code was entirely the City’s to direct. The team could go through and tighten up the Code language and include guidelines for the purposes of this section if that was the direction of the Commission.
- The Commission agreed it would be good to tighten up such words, provide guidelines. Because the DRB’s membership changes, Board members did not know what had been decided on previous projects or a part of a project, so it was better to have guidelines to provide more consistency, especially between phases of a development.
 - Some plans were not built as approved because the Planning Department had to accept some things that the developer just could not do, so there was also variation at a later stage in the process than just the DRB decision.
 - Subjective terms provided wiggle room and the opportunity to argue for things. Commissioners and DRB members sought objective, easy-to-measure predictability in the Code, but such provisions provided too

much leeway for someone to get outside of the original goals of what the Commission and City Council wanted because there was too much room without an objective measure.

- Parameters were absolutely needed for the DRB because it was often a matter of how well the applicant presented an alternative to sway the Board when there were no good guidelines or parameters to work within. That could be good for the applicant, but not for sticking with parameters that ensure the quality that the City wanted.
- The City of Wilsonville divided the quasi-judicial and legislative processes. Writing Code belonged to the legislative side and applying the Code was the quasi-judicial part. The language allowed the quasi-judicial to act in place of Code-makers.
- Mr. Dills confirmed the direction was to revise the language toward more clear and objective standards.
- Section 4.127(.03)F (Page 4 of 68) What might this provision mean for anyone who may or may not want to have home-sharing or Airbnb type options for their homes? There had been a lot of conversations recently about the subject, so it might be worth considering in this process to see if it should be revisited.
- Section 4.127 (.02)I. Mr. Neamtzu explained conversations about manufactured homes had been fairly minimal over the years, though a lot occurred around the time of the Thunderbird Mobile Club Park closure. State law required the City to accommodate manufactured housing as a permitted housing type under the Building Code, so this Code section simply mirrored what was already in the PDR standards for permitted uses and ancillary uses. If someone wanted to put a manufactured home in a single-family subdivision, there was a process for that through the Building Department. He did not believe the number of manufactured homes could be limited in an area as doing so might be a violation of fair housing rules.
 - Mr. Neamtzu confirmed the proposed residential design codes would apply to any manufactured home, adding the fundamental difference was whether a home was stick-built on the site or stick-built in a factory and brought to the site.
- Concerns were expressed about the quality of manufactured versus stick-built homes and having a concentration of them in Frog Pond.
 - Mr. Neamtzu stated no one he has spoken to was even contemplating manufactured homes in Frog Pond. He appreciated the concern, but given the lot sizes, price of land and cost of development, it would seem unlikely for a developer to choose that housing type, particularly in the West Neighborhood compared to other parts of Wilsonville.
- On page 1 of 68, Commissioner Springfield noted the very first point on the memo from Don Hanson talked about attached single-family units. He recalls the Commission saying no more than two items to be attached in the single-family category. He noted they were asking four-to-five. He asked whether the Commission just wanted to say no to this or should the Commission consider incorporating this.
- Section 4.127 (.02)C. (Page 1) Mr. Neamtzu clarified that a conscientious decision was made last November after lengthy discussions that the West Neighborhood would be a single-family, detached subdivision, so the Plan did not accommodate four to five attached units as requested in the memo from Otak. He noted the parties were not at the table during those discussions in 2015. He did not believe incorporating that housing type would be genuine to the Concept Plan at this point in time as it would involve going back and reopening the Concept Plan and having those conversations over again.
 - He noted that Staff just received the memo today and he intended to write responses to all of Mr. Hanson's written comments, and explain to him and Mr. Grimberg how the City had arrived at the decision to limit attached dwelling units to two.
 - He clarified duplexes were considered single-family, so as proposed the Code allowed for two, but three attached units was a multi-family housing product that the Plan did not accommodate, so there would be no row homes in the West Neighborhood.

Mr. Dills outlined the revisions to draft Code text and policies presented in the meeting packet, which included Code and Residential Design Standards; Monuments, Gateways, and Signs; and Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments, as noted in the work session agenda provided on Page 1 of 68 of the packet.

Discussion and comments regarding the revised Code language to implement the Frog Pond Master Plan were as follows with responses from the project team as noted:

Code and Residential Design Standards:

- Section 4.127 (0.15)G.a (Page 18 of 68) Vinyl siding was listed as a prohibited material because higher quality than vinyl siding was desired.
- Section 4.127 (0.15)E.q Objective standards were needed if there were variance standards elsewhere. Having the DRB making decisions was one thing, but giving the planning director some leeway was another.
 - As with the other references regarding the DRB's discretion and the need for clear and objective standards, the subject language added a layer of discretion that could actually bypass the DRB. Such subjective standards should not be granted to a single person when the DRB was available, and there was still some discomfort with the DRB having such discretion without objective standards.
 - Mr. Dills explained the language was included to give the director the authority to address individual issues like whether a 46.5 inch front stoop was acceptable as opposed to the 48-inch standard.
 - Giving the director that authority would be like a single property type of variance rather than overall design-type variances for projects. However, the subject Code section addressed a big-picture, multi-home type development and approval process, so the language did not seem to fit.
 - (0.15)E.q should reference (0.15)A, the purpose statement for the Residential Design Standards, "Other items meeting the purpose of this section..." Purpose statements were very important within the Code to express the issue of clear intent the Commission had been discussing.
- Even though much of the proposed Code offered the opportunity for variation, but most of the homes would look pretty similar. Existing homes in the area looked the same, and homes that look very different from the normal Northwest style, like in Villebois, did not sell very well. Other parts of the country had broader variations in architecture.
- In Table 2 on Page 20 of 68, Note I was corrected to state, "...the minimum combined side yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 10 ft."

Monuments, Gateways, and Signs:

- The project team did not have a strong opinion about what the monument at the Boeckman Creek Bridge would state. It could say East Wilsonville. "Frog Pond" applied to the entire 500-acre area of the project. Frog Pond seemed an appropriate way to mark the entrance; but perhaps, it could be done in combination with Boeckman Creek, because it was such an important crossing and connection down toward Town Center and Memorial Park. Any monument language would be consistent with language in the Vision Statement "Integration with the community and a part of Wilsonville".
 - The Commission discussed suggestions about what the monument should state, noting the proximity of Boeckman Creek and the proposed Boeckman Trail. Coffee Creek did not reference Villebois, but the creek.
 - Since Boeckman Rd actually divided old and new development north and south, just focusing on the Frog Pond part, would ignore the people in the other developments on the other side.
 - Having the sign note one was driving into Frog Pond would create confusion since those living in Meadows used the same road to get to Meadows.
 - Boeckman Creek would be great. Villebois probably did not care that about the Coffee Creek monument, but there could be a problem with it stating Frog Pond because might irritate those in Meadows who already had an identity.
 - There were also other opportunities to identify Frog Pond with the two neighborhood gateways.
- Mr. Dills clarified that the Trail Plan included a trailhead for the Boeckman Trail was planned in conjunction with the linear park, which he indicated on the map on Page 24 of 65. From a site-specific sense, it was difficult to know how trail users or pedestrians on Boeckman Rd would get down to the creek until the bridge was redesigned with a set of stairs or sidewalk. The common theme was that there should be a pedestrian access at that juncture, but how that would be done was still unknown.
 - Although no trailhead would be located at the bridge, it was worth signing that one was going over Boeckman Creek, and it would also provide opportunity for environmental education.

- The Welcome to City sign should have some uniformity with other Welcome to Wilsonville signs. The existing Welcome to Wilsonville sign on Wilsonville Rd coming from Sherwood was a wooden monument sign that just stated “City of Wilsonville” and had the old logo.
 - Mr. Neamtzu suggested addressing monuments, gateways, and signage in a more comprehensive way through the wayfinding project currently in the City’s budget. The new City logo could provide a fresh opportunity to brand the City’s monumentation in a great way. Universal Health on the north end of town wanted to identify something there, and the wooden routed monuments at Fox Chase on the west side and next to Landover on Wilsonville Rd were pretty outdated and could use a fresh look. There were also two huge monuments at I-5 and Wilsonville Rd, but nothing at Elligsen Rd.
- At the major Stafford Rd/Boeckman Rd intersection, trees and a more natural approach (Landforms and tall vegetation, Page 35 of 68) was preferred for the enhanced landscaping because it blended better and was more pleasant looking than a big hard structure. One concern was to make Frog Pond another part of Wilsonville and using a large monument there would cut it off from the rest of the city.
 - The visuals of a more natural approach might take away from power lines, too; although there would be some limitations due to the power lines.
- Subordinating subdivision identities within the neighborhood was suggested to avoid detracting from the overall Frog Pond identity. Each development or developer should not decide on their own name and have that as a prominent identification. Neighborhood identities should be subordinated consciously and carefully to the overall identity of Frog Pond so a subdivision’s identity did not overpower the larger neighborhood identity.
 - Villebois provided a parallel example as various builders had sub brands during the development and marketing of their properties, but once built out, it was all Villebois, not a lot of individual neighborhoods. Like Villebois, the City wanted Frog Pond to be a unified, cohesive neighborhood.

Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments:

- Implementation Measure 3.1.11.e (Page 53) When the language in regarding neighborhood parks was written, the idea was that neighborhood parks would be provided and maintained by Home Owners Associations (HOAs) and would not be the City’s responsibility. The Infrastructure Funding Plan for Frog Pond, which was still being developed and would be reviewed by the Commission, took a slightly different direction. The revised language regarding “other entities” reflected that there would be two publicly-maintained parks. Because 15 to 20 developments would be knitted together over time, no single HOA would be created to care for them.
 - The subject language was one of several references where the Code language was broadened to allow for a public strategy in addition to the HOA strategy.
 - Mr. Dills explained that while there was a practical need to broaden the language to allow the Wilsonville Code to be interpreted by future Planning Commissions and City Councils, it could be narrowed to say “HOA or the City”. “Other entities” would allow the City to delegate to some other party, such as a parks district or private party.
- Implementation Measure 4.1.4.u (Page 57) Mr. Neamtzu explained the gaps in the densities were created by a large rewrite of the Code about 15 years ago. Staff’s plan for addressing this complex problem was the Density and Consistency Project. A consultant from APG had helped Staff considerably in teasing apart the City’s standards and building a new process that filled the gaps. Because the Frog Pond project was tied to the actual density standards in the Development Code, the density gaps could not be fixed in the subject language. All of the work to address the issue would be presented in the future as one package.
 - Mr. Dills added a different approach was taken in Frog Pond to streamline the process and be clear about the subdistricts to find minimum and maximum numbers of units.
- Implementation Measure 3.1.11.e (Page 53) The two neighborhood parks and the smaller, open-space tracts in the higher-density, small-lot subdistrict would be maintained by HOAs. It seemed unbalanced that the people with the biggest homes would benefit from the parks, but not have any responsibility for maintaining parks. The smaller tracts and neighborhood parks would not be where the larger homes were located, but those homes would have an HOA and still benefit from the parks.

- Mr. Dills agreed HOAs for small lots with open-space set-asides would have responsibilities that others would not. Open space, stormwater, or other tracts of land were likely to appear in other parts of the community because of design intent by a particular project. There was a proposal for a co-housing project with a central open space. There would undoubtedly be tree grove site design direction and regulation by the City that would place the grove in an open space tract. There would be ownership and maintenance responsibilities in other areas that came from those types of decisions.

Mr. Dills stated the project team was preparing a draft West Frog Pond Master Plan that would be adopted by the City as a supporting document to the Comprehensive Plan. It would contain all the topics discussed by the Commission, from residential design through public realm recommendations. The project team would be working over the next couple of weeks to incorporate the new school proposal and present a 90 percent draft for the Commission's review and discussion at the January meeting. Additional topics or final refinements could be discussed at a work session in February in preparation for a public hearing in March.

- The major revisions resulting from the school's new location would involve changing the central part of the Boeckman Rd frontage, which would no longer be residential on the maps. The project team had gone through the refinements to the Street Demonstration Plan, so only refinements would be needed since the grid the project team set up served the group of properties there very well. The grid was used as the base for the Street Tree Plan, which would change a little bit. The changes would trickle through about 15 different graphics, but the real substance was a different land use at that location.
- He indicated the location of the 10-acre tax lot owned by the school district, and noted the adjacent tax lot, which extended to the Willow Creek swale, was not part of the school district's school designation.

Commissioner Millan asked about the impact of losing some housing on the funding mechanisms for some of the infrastructure.

- Mr. Neamtzu replied Staff had begun researching the System Development Charges (SDCs) paid by schools to be able to recalibrate the analysis that was done. Staff would pull data from employee counts and recently built schools for comparison and show the Commission how everything might impact the bottom line.

Chair Greenfield called for public comment.

James Wolfston, Frog Pond resident, asked how the district's new school would impact the completion date of the plan.

Mr. Neamtzu responded the Master Plan would go to the Planning Commission in March and City Council the following month. He anticipated it would take more than one meeting for the Planning Commission to conclude the public hearing and adopt the Master Plan, but could be adopted by Council as early as May. The City would continue responding to citizen concerns and comments throughout the process.

Ben Altman, Pioneer Design Group, representing Mr. Wolfston, said he supported some of the recommendations from Arbor, in terms of the menu approach to the architectural design, which had been incorporated. It was important to provide flexibility.

- He explained there were two types of manufactured housing, mobile-homes, which were now all called manufactured, and modular designs that were stick-built and assembled in a factory, and then brought to a site to be put together. He anticipated seeing some modular designs because the criteria in the menu would not fit a typical manufactured, mobile-type unit very well. A custom design would be needed to fit into those criteria, so he did not believe it would be a concern.
 - Under the Goal 10 Housing Rule, manufactured housing was a needed housing type and therefore the City must provide for it. It could not be precluded, but specific standards could be adopted. There were already some standards in the Code about mobile-type units, but no standards addressed modular units, which fell more under the conventional stick-built home.
- The language of the Code language must provide for "rigid flexibility." The Code had some rigidity to it in terms of the overall guidance needed, which was how the current PDR section came about. The standard R5/R7 zones were very prescriptive and some flexibility was needed. The planned development section was

created to allow less rigid requirements, but development had to stay within the provided guidelines, which came back to the Purpose Statement that drives all that. The Commission was headed in the right direction, but some flexibility had to be maintained.

- The current menu had enough choices to provide variety. The reason everything looked the same was because many of the code standards were too tight. If only five, six or eight options were provided, a lack of variety would result, and every third house would look the same. More flexibility in the menu criteria would result in a better variety.
- He supported the idea of maintaining Frog Pond as the overall name. There would need to be some ways to create additions, phases, or neighborhoods within Frog Pond because a plat name was part of the platting requirements; for example, Frog Pond Phase 1, 2 and 3, or Addition 1, 2, etc. It made sense to have an overall name, like Villebois, because the Frog Pond neighborhood would have the same character.
- The new primary school site essentially added a third neighborhood park, which should be considered in the context of the small lot to see how much open space needed to spill over. Accessibility to open space was an issue, but the smaller lots were also closer to Boeckman Creek, which was all open space. He was concerned about adding open space on top of open space. He suggested revisiting the open space in the context of now having the school within the neighborhood.

Don Hanson, Otak, representing West Hills, stated he would work through the items in his memorandum with Staff, but would not go through them in detail this evening. He had proposed that more than two attached units might be a possibility, but now sensed that was not the case, adding he was fortunate to not have been involved in the 2015 discussions.

- He believed Mr. Altman's comments about open space and the school site were well taken. The school would be in a good, walkable location. Young students living in the neighborhood could get there safely. They were looking forward to the new school location and hoped open space could be revisited, not from square one, but in terms of refinements.
- He found Commissioner Postma's comments on objective standards for the DRB very compelling. The more clear and objective the standards, the better for the Panel as well as the applicants. They would know what they were responding to and how to design their projects. He noted there were always exceptions and that was why the Purpose Statements in the Code were relied upon.
- He loved the ideas regarding monument signs for the neighborhood and agreed that the more it could be cohesive and just identify the neighborhood, the better. It was okay as long as there could still be some marketing signs during the build out. Having it all under the Frog Pond banner was the way to go as Frog Pond was a cool name.
- He was happy to hear about the new timeline and now that the school district had committed, Staff could move forward in collaboration with them.

C. Transit Master Plan (Lashbrook)

Stephan Lashbrook, SMART Transit Director, stated he was primarily before the Commission to set the stage for the public hearing in March on the new Transit Master Plan (TMP). Staff had been working on the TMP for about four years, and this last year, a self-appointed and very dedicated citizen task force had been involved. There was a lot of potential for controversy at the public, especially among serious transit riders, as SMART was discussing making changes to routes and schedules.

- The TMP was a subset of the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) which was a subset of the Comprehensive Plan. The TMP was not regulatory, but a guidance document for SMART, City Council, and the Budget Committee when making decisions about SMART's investments. In some ways, the TMP was more of a financial document than a typical planning document.
 - One key aspect was that the TMP put the City in a position to secure grant funding. SMART was funded primarily through local payroll taxes but also received grants from Clackamas County, Metro, ODOT, and sometimes from federal highway money, but usually Federal Transit Administration money.

- Almost invariably, grant applications discussed local planning and public outreach processes, so it was very important to show that the TMP was adopted by City Council through a specific public process and identified how grant money would be used.
- He reviewed the roles of the Planning Commission in the review process, which included acting as the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) to ensure adequate public involvement and determining whether the new Master Plan complied with the TSP and Comprehensive Plan or created any conflicts that needed to be resolved. Some conflicts, such as those related to route and schedule changes, could be forwarded for City Council to resolve.
- He noted more than 1,300 comments were received and summarized two key suggestions that were guiding the TMP as it was being finalized as follows:
 - Increase ridership versus coverage of the transit system by having more buses focused on main avenues and connection points for more frequency on routes and fewer stops dispersed throughout the community. This would result more people having to get to the buses, but he did not see drastic changes to the system as Dial-a-Ride provided services to any house in town if the rider qualified.
 - Increase the connections between Wilsonville and other cities rather than service within the City.
- As a result of increased PERS costs, SMART would have an \$85,000 hit to the budget next year, increasing to at least \$100,000 within two years; a substantial amount for a small transit agency as \$100,000 paid for bus and driver for an eight-hour shift, which was a lot of service.
 - Fortunately, payroll taxes in the community were stable and gradually on the incline. More jobs in the community would fund more service for transit in the future. The redevelopment of the Xerox site and the potential for new development on the Mentor Graphics property south of Boeckman Road meant new revenue potential for SMART.
- There was also complete uncertainty about revenue sources. No one could anticipate the level of transportation funding from the federal government. In any given year, that could mean a \$1 million impact on SMART's budget.
- Staff's approach to the TMP was different from most transit plans, which were usually a compilation of intended tasks and projects for when more money was available. Instead, the new TSP would also provide specific recommendations to City Council for cuts to be made in a certain order if less money was available.
 - If there was a steady stream of money, and the PERS obligations could be covered, very few changes would be made. If more money became available through a State transportation package or a new, large industry moved in with 5,000 highly paid employees, transit service would be increased for the community.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked if the TMP included plans to increase funding by taxation or other avenues.
 - Mr. Lashbrook responded the TMP would include a menu of possible funding sources but no specific recommendation about utilizing any particular source. He added one of the clearest statements from the 1300 comments was from the local business community strongly stating they had done their share and to look elsewhere for additional funds.
- Stated a big concern among the business community was the impetus toward more service, which meant more money, and the easy target was those who did not have a direct vote, which had always been his concern. There were all these plans for business growth and construction in places by Day Road, Coffee Creek and Basalt Creek, but to what effect if their taxes were increased with the notion that they would not be distributed elsewhere.
- Noted were other discussions with Mr. Lashbrook about the inefficiencies of fare boxes, etc. but there were routes other than expecting businesses to foot the entire bill if services were increased. Small businesses were a big engine for the community. He was concerned that increased services without conscientiousness toward small businesses would have a negative impact on the community's ability to attract small businesses to Wilsonville.

Mr. Lashbrook confirmed the SMART payroll tax applied to all businesses and some units of government uniformly, regardless of their size, traffic volumes, etc.; however, the set rate did not apply to non-profits, schools, churches, etc. SMART's payroll tax rate was .5 percent. TriMet's rate was .737 percent.

- Wilsonville's job base was one reason why SMART existed and why it had been able to provide services for so many years. He believed the taxable payroll in Wilsonville was more than \$900 million.
- He concluded that he hoped to have the draft TMP for the Commission in a few weeks, adding he would move forward with scheduling the public hearing as soon as possible.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2017 Planning Commission Work Program

Commissioner Levit recalled that City Council was trying to come up with some plans to alleviate traffic on Wilsonville Rd, suggesting the installation of cameras. He noticed recently that more drivers blatantly running red lights and block intersections. It was getting to a point where drivers running red lights were an expected outcome. He asked what the City planned to do.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated there had been a lot of discussion on the topic, which City Council raised regularly in work sessions. He knew a staff member was assigned to work on the red light problem and report back to Council for a much more comprehensive look at the camera program. The cameras in Sherwood on Hwy 99 had significantly cut back on red light running incidents.

- The City did add a lot of additional signage stating, "Do not block intersection", such as at the Boones Ferry/Wilsonville Rd interchange.
- There had been a lot of conversation with the police force to increase enforcement. He had just met the new police chief, who would be brought up to speed on the issue.
- He agreed to communicate the Commission's concerns to Council.
- He clarified that the existing cameras in the City were ODOT cameras that monitored traffic and signaled the lights; they were not used for enforcement. He described the camera system used in Sherwood at two Hwy 99 intersections. The thousands of photos taken were fielded by a company in Arizona. The system created a tremendous amount of work because somebody had to determine the validity of the violation at the local level, and then coordinate with the national companies running the cameras and doing the actual distribution of the violations through the mail.
 - The reduction in red-light running was clear, but a tremendous amount of effort and investment was involved. Some areas installed the cameras for revenue, but revenue decreased as drivers stopped running red lights.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, Assistant City Attorney, added that the Wilsonville contract with Clackamas County Sheriff's Office had a dedicated traffic officer, but other deputies could still issue citations. More monitoring had also been occurring.

- A possible concern was that when traffic cameras were implemented, an officer had to sign off on it. It needed to be determined whether Wilsonville needed to get an additional person from Clackamas County to cover that or if Wilsonville's traffic officer could handle it.
- She offered to provide a report for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Millan preferred having a short update during a Commission meeting. Red light running had become a common problem and many citizens were very concerned. She would like to understand the options being considered, knowing it would help the Commission, especially given the Town Center and Frog Pond Master Plans as well as the TMP. The hope was to reduce traffic, but if that did not happen, the TMP was lacking something.

Commissioner Springall noted that throughout the election cycle, people felt they were not being heard. Traffic was a huge issue and some have asked what forum was available to explain to concerned citizens about what was being done. The Planning Commission was the CCI, and they were not talking about the issue.

Commissioner Levit believed there were two separate issues. Traffic could be reduced, but that would not stop drivers from running red lights. People violated laws to avoid the traffic congestion.

Chair Greenfield commented that he hoped Wilsonville would not have a celebrated road rage case.

Mr. Neamtzu thanked the Commissioners for their flexibility in meeting so close to Christmas.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2017
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Minutes
Approved as corrected off
the record
April 12, 2017*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm. Those present:

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Peter Hurley, Al Levit, Kamran Mesbah, Phyllis Millan, and Simon Springall.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Steve Adams, Dwight Brashear, Miranda Bateschell, Eric Loomis, and Zach Weigel

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chair Greenfield announced Staff would be requesting a continuance of the Transit Master Plan public hearing to a time certain.

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

UPDATE ON LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated that at the City Council's retreat, Council decided to change how it handled the Council liaison assignments due to the increasingly busy and complicated schedules of the Councilors. Going forward, City Councilors would not attend Planning Commission meetings to provide a report; instead, written summary minutes from each City Council meeting would be provided in the Commission meeting packets. He would field Commissioner questions on behalf of City Council, since he attended most of the meetings, and research any questions as necessary and report back to the Commission. Conversely, his written summary reports of the Planning Commission meetings would be included in the City Manager's monthly report, instead of being read at City Council meetings. Finally, any City Councilor was willing to attend any Planning Commission meeting upon request by the Commission. This new program was implemented yesterday.

- Additionally, City Council was working to schedule an annual summit so the Planning Commission, Development Review Boards, and City Council could share ideas, concepts, and concerns in a larger venue. Such meetings have been held in the past and more details would follow.
- Future City Council/Planning Commission joint work sessions would continue to focus on long-range projects, such as the upcoming joint work sessions on the Town Center Area Plan.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

A. Consideration of the February 8, 2017 Planning Commission minutes
The February 8, 2017 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. LEGISLATIVE HEARING

A. Transit Master Plan Hearing

Chair Greenfield read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:13 pm.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, verified no audience members were present for the Transit Master Plan public hearing. He introduced Dwight Brashear, the new South Metro Regional Transit (SMART) Director, and Transit Operations Manager Eric Loomis and made the following comments:

- The project team prepared an additional chapter of financial information, which was distributed to the Commission that City Council discussed at its work session Monday night.
- The Transit Master Plan has been in a state of flux, but the financial analysis had been prepared, which was important information for the business community and the Chamber of Commerce, in particular.
- With his March 1 starting date, Mr. Brashear needed time to review the Transit Master Plan to ensure the Plan was reflective of the direction he saw the Transit Department going. Therefore, Staff was requesting that the public hearing be continued to a date certain, which would fulfill the City's legal noticing requirements. He noted anything else could be entered into the record at this time.

Dwight Brashear stated he had only been with the City eight days and commended Mr. Loomis and City Staff for bringing him up to speed on SMART. He confirmed he needed time to review the Transit Master Plan and asked to continue the public hearing to May 10, 2017 and schedule a Planning Commission work session on April 12. He believed it was important not to rush through something so vital to the City of Wilsonville.

Eric Loomis presented an overview of the new financial chapter, titled "New Service Priorities" with these comments:

- Public and City Council input on the first draft of the Transit Master Plan indicated no cost analysis was included for the new service priorities or changes. The project team wanted to ensure everyone involved in the process that no new costs were being added to the Transit Master Plan.
- The New Service Priorities Chapter provided a cost analysis of the current service costs, as well as the new service priorities costs, once the Transit Master Plan was implemented. The total at the bottom of Page 79 showed that the current and projected annual costs were very close, demonstrating that the Transit Plan was not adding any service or additional costs.
 - Transit Staff developed the lists of priorities on the next two pages, based on internal discussions about what would happen if additional funding came in or if funding was reduced. The first priority list showed the priority level Staff set for different service scenarios along with the estimated cost so Staff could add a certain priority level for customers should extra funding come in. The second priority list showed what to scale back for a service level should the funding be cut or fall short in some way.
 - In the remainder of the chapter, priority lists were developed for each individual route based on an increase or decrease in funding.
- Transit Staff had no inclination of any funding sources going away or fiscal cliffs in the next year, but assumed the Department would run on the same budget. Staff just wanted to make people aware of the different priorities that SMART might come across and keep the Master Plan available for different options.
- He clarified DAR stood for the Dial-A-Ride or Paratransit program.

Mr. Neamtzu suggested the Commission review the new chapter over the next couple of weeks and ask any questions of Mr. Brashear or Mr. Loomis in preparation for the April work session. He noted the Master Plan would undergo some reorganization and the new financial chapter would be inserted, likely with some new text, so Transit Staff would be highlighting a new Master Plan in April.

Commissioner Postma thanked Staff for the cost analysis, which he had been requesting for some time, as he did not like changing plans without knowing the costs, which was incredibly important for transparency. His personal views as a Planning Commissioner were the same as his views as a Board Member and Public Policy Chair for the Chamber of Commerce. Both he, as a Commissioner, and the Chamber were sensitive about the

sustainability of the model of how the funding was currently happening. Having just under 80 percent of the City's current model funded primarily from payroll taxes with a very small portion coming from the fare box and almost 20 percent of the funding reliant upon federal grants was a scary prospect for businesses. While this involved discussion might fall outside the Transit Master Plan, he personally could not separate the two. He wanted a conversation about the funding model at the work session and the public hearing.

Commissioner Mesbah asked to see a benefit analysis in addition to the cost analysis. He noted in the City of Madison, the largest growth in bus ridership came from employees who lived in the downtown, but worked at a software company located 15 miles to the southwest, so the company subsidized the bus route because it benefitted them. He assumed businesses in Wilsonville also benefitted from the availability of free rides on the bus system. If the City was going to zero in on the costs the businesses were footing, then it would also be good to compare what benefits the businesses were receiving.

- He agreed with Commissioner Postma it would be unfair if all the costs were continuously shoved into one or another pocket without the community participating. The fairness would be good to look at, but also the benefits the system provided for employers.
- As far as a metric, he suggested monetizing the benefits would make for an easy comparison of a dollar-to-dollar metric. Considerations could include what facilities businesses would have to pay for to compensate for having no bus system. If quantification was not available, then a qualitative analysis of the kinds of benefits the businesses were receiving should be done.

Commissioner Postma said he would leave the metrics to the experts. He assumed ridership data could assist with the analysis. The fare box was approximately one percent of the funding, which demonstrated that riders also saw a benefit making for a unique cost-benefit analysis.

- Mr. Brashear noted past and recent studies demonstrated that every dollar invested in public transit returned up to ten dollars. A recent study by the American Public Transit Association spoke about 90 percent of transit system boardings having some level of impact on the city providing the service, which was significant, so there was gain through more than the fare box.
 - He had worked in cities like San Diego that invested heavily in transit systems, which resulted in a huge boom in business and economic development. Portland did a model study where a half mile of light rail corridor showed a return of a couple billion dollars of investment within that corridor. He would share the information from the studies with the Commission.

Commissioner Mesbah cautioned about mixing apples and oranges because the densification and value added to properties around a light rail station did not occur with a bus stop. He was familiar with the studies and wanted to make sure the analysis fit Wilsonville's conditions to the best of Staff's ability.

Commissioner Postma moved to continue the public hearing on the Transit Master Plan to May 10, 2017 date certain. Commissioner Mesbah seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

B. Frog Pond Master Plan

Chair Greenfield read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:33 pm.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, expressed his pride in the work done on the Frog Pond West Master Plan by the Planning Commission over the past 16 months. The process had been very open, collaborative, and welcoming with eight work sessions and 15 to 20 hours spent talking about the details around all aspects of the Master Plan. The collaboration and shared ideas from the property owner and developer partners resulted in a better plan, which the project team and community worked very hard on.

- The Planning Commission action tonight, should the Commission reach a formal decision this evening, would be a recommendation of approval of the package of improvements to City Council. He clarified for the

public that the Planning Commission was an advisory body to City Council and did not make decisions. The City Council public hearing was scheduled for April 17th.

- The Frog Pond West Master Plan was proposed to be adopted as a sub element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Master Plan applied only to the West Neighborhood, which was approximately 181 acres in area and bounded by Boeckman Creek to the west, Boeckman Rd to the south, and Stafford Rd to the east, with the northern boundary being the lots running on the north side of Frog Pond Ln. The Frog Pond West Master Plan built upon the Frog Pond Area Plan, often referred to as Phase 1, which the City Council adopted in November 2015. The Master Plan was consistent with the vision established in the Area Plan containing all single-family detached homes in three primary categories: R-10, which were Large Lots of 8,000 to 12,000 sq ft; R-7, Medium Lots of 6,000 to 8,000 sq ft; and R-5, Small Lots of about 4,000 to 6,000 sq ft in size.
- The two school district properties were now proposed for changes after being programmed for residential uses throughout most of 2016. Late in 2016, the District's 10-acre parcel fronting on Boeckman Road was programmed for a future school site, and the District has agreed to work with the City on possibly siting a neighborhood park on a portion of their land-banked parcel.
- The Frog Pond West Master Plan contained a maximum of 571 dwelling units at build out, which would take many years to achieve. With the many small parcels involved, one main goal of the Master Plan was to knit together a cohesive and complete community as opposed to what could be upwards of 10 to 15 different individual development reviews.
 - The 571 units in the proposed Master Plan were 39 units less than the adopted Area Plan and a couple hundred fewer homes than modeled in the 2013 Transportation System Plan (TSP). Staff did updates to the TSP in 2016 and all of the City's assumptions had been less than expected throughout the process.
- The Master Plan document contained sections on Purpose and Scope, the Vision, Principles and Intent, Land Use, Residential Community Design, Transportation, Parks and Open Space, Lighting, Street Trees, Gateways and Signage, and Implementation. The appendix included a draft Infrastructure Funding Plan as well as other items.
 - The lighting section was new and proposed a Dark Sky compliant approach to street lighting, utilizing new technology and LED lights with attractive functional fixtures and based on the functional classification of the streets. Some thought was given to how to light paths, trailheads, and parks while being sensitive to the natural areas. The Master Plan included three to four new pages in the Lighting Chapter along with a new map addressing lighting.
- While the project team had been working hard with the development partners on the Infrastructure Funding Plan, the Planning Commission did not need to resolve the issues surrounding infrastructure funding tonight. The framework memorandum in the Commission's packet discussed many of the tools the project team would like to pursue. The project team had been actively engaged with the development community trying to find common ground but this interactive process would take time.
 - The Frog Pond West Master Plan was not likely to be adopted until there was agreement on the Infrastructure Funding Plan, but the funding was not something the Commission needed to worry about. Input from the Commission regarding general direction and things for City Council to consider in their decision-making process would be helpful and useful.
- The Master Plan established and applied a Residential Neighborhood Comprehensive Plan Map designation to the residential areas and applied a Public Facilities designation to the two western most parcels that the Wilsonville-West Linn School District owned.
 - The Master Plan did not apply zoning to the property and zoning was not under consideration tonight. Zoning would be done as part of the individual property owner initiated land use applications that would come forward for residential development consistent with the Master Plan and requests for annexation into the City of Wilsonville.
- He highlighted via PowerPoint (Slide 2, Exhibit R) the five proposed amendments with these key additional comments:

- A Comprehensive Plan Map would establish the Residential Neighborhood and Public Facilities designations.
- The Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments (Exhibit C) created goals, policies, and implementation measures around the Residential Neighborhood designation and the combing of the Comprehensive Plan to ensure compliance with those changes, such as changes to the Parks and Recreation sections of the Comprehensive Plan as they related to neighborhood parks.
- The amendment to the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) map would add the small creek just north of Willow Creek Ln, which had not been previously mapped in the City's 2000 inventory.
- Amendments to the Development Code text would create a new Residential Neighborhood Zone (Exhibit D), which included all the necessary associated changes to support and ensure consistency as this zone was adopted.
- Finally, the Frog Pond West Master Plan itself would be adopted as a sub element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, containing the full force and effect of the Comprehensive Plan.
- The Commission spent a considerable amount of time reviewing and discussing all the proposed amendments in work sessions.
- The voluminous public record was provided on a flash drive to the Commission, but also posted on the City's website for more than seven days, which met all the State statutes for public record review. Public hearing notices were posted throughout the community and mailed to property owners in the study area and within 500 ft of the study area, as well as to agencies with which Staff regularly engaged and the City's extensive interested parties list. Notifications were also published in the Spokesman Journal, Boones Ferry Messenger and via social media leading up to this hearing.
- He reviewed the Frog Pond Master Plan Records listed in the updated Frog Pond Master Plan Record Index dated March 8, 2017, which replaced Page 10 of 10 in the Staff report, with the following additional comments and entered new exhibits received this week into the record as noted:
 - Exhibit F: The Master Plan Findings Report contained the applicable criteria Staff identified as needing to be satisfied in order to adopt the Master Plan. It was an extensive set of written findings speaking to compliance with state, regional, and local rules, regulations, and policies. Specific items included:
 - A revised Traffic Impact Analysis report, which was written after the school district made its announcement, so the 571 dwelling units could be reviewed from a traffic modeling standpoint.
 - Statewide Planning Goal 12 Findings for the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), which were critical for Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT); ODOT provided Exhibit O, which stated they had no concerns and that adopting the Master Plan would have no associated impacts to the State highway system.
 - Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, Title XI Concept Planning for New Urban Areas, and a compliance report and findings in support of the Functional Plan and the requirements around concept planning and master planning the Frog Pond Area.
 - The SROZ and related economic, social, environmental, and energy analysis and findings required under Statewide Planning Goal 5, Protection of Natural Resources, to include the small drainage ditch north of Willow Creek Lane in the Frog Pond Study Area.
 - New Exhibit N: Letter from Ben Altman, Pioneer Design Group dated March 6, 2017. He would respond tonight to some of the issues Mr. Altman raised.
 - New Exhibit O: Email exchange between Marah Danielson, Senior Planner at ODOT, and Planning Director Chris Neamtzu, in which Ms. Danielson stated there were no problems with the Oregon TPR.
 - New Exhibit P: Technical memorandum from Scott Mansur, DKS dated March 7, 2017 regarding the Frog Pond Willow Creek Drive Alignment Transportation Evaluation. Councilor Starr had requested Staff review the memo, which involved analyzing an offset intersection at Boeckman Rd and Willow Creek Dr as Willow Creek's extension north into the West Neighborhood. The memo discussed the challenges of offsetting intersections and some issues associated with them.
 - New Exhibit Q: Letter from property owner Amy Thurmond dated March 6, 2017, in support of the Master Plan.

- New Exhibit R: Staff's Frog Pond Master Plan PowerPoint presentation dated March 8, 2017

Project Manager Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group, continued the PowerPoint presentation, reviewing the Frog Pond Master Plan with these additional comments:

- The Frog Pond Area Plan was the starting point for the Frog Pond West Master Plan. The 181-acre West Neighborhood was in the context of a three neighborhood areas of 500 acres that wrapped around the existing city. Work done for the Area Plan knitted together, in the broadest sense, the land uses, transportation, infrastructure, and open space frameworks.
- The Vision Statement about planning a cohesive place was an important theme driving the project team and Planning Commission's detailed discussions about standards and specific proposals. The intent was to plan a cohesive neighborhood where individual private developments and public realm investments would fit together, look nice together, and function well, as opposed to a collection of individual developments that did not connect into a coordinated whole.
- He reviewed the amendments proposed for the Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council:
 - The first requested action was to adopt the actual Comprehensive Plan Map designations, which would add the Residential Neighborhood designation as well as the Public Facilities designation to the two school district properties, as shown on (Slide 7), to the Comprehensive Plan Map.
 - The Comprehensive Plan text amendments involved a new two-page section describing the Residential Neighborhood Designation and providing the enabling language that created the actual Map designation. The language defined the purpose, which was carried forward into the Code. It required area plans and master plans as the basis for when the Residential Neighborhood designation was applied. The section specifically discussed the integrated and comprehensive type of planning the Commission and project team had been doing where land use, transportation, utilities, open space, and natural resources were considered together and coordinated into a whole.
 - The supporting Administrative Amendments included broadening some neighborhood park language to retain past language about recognizing that private development provided neighborhood parks but that public neighborhood parks could be created in Wilsonville, specifically through the legislative master planning process.
 - The SROZ Amendment would add a small unnamed tributary to the SROZ. Though not currently mapped as SROZ by the City, the tributary was consistent with the City's criteria and would be added as a resource area. There were no changes to the Boeckman Creek SROZ.
 - To resolve access issues to a couple properties immediately adjacent to this additional SROZ, the project team mapped one street crossing. (See Street Demonstration Plan)
- The Residential Neighborhood Zone was a new zone for Wilsonville that applied to Frog Pond West and was intended to apply to the East and South Neighborhoods should those areas be added to the urban growth boundary (UGB). In addition to doing all the things that zone districts typically did, the new zone also created neighborhood and residential design standards as the test and standards that developers must meet. Currently, this was done either through the CC&Rs of individual developments, conditions of approval, or the Village Master Plan Standards in Villebois.
 - Permitted and Conditional Uses were adjusted from those of the Planned Development Residential Zone as a new definition was added in the Definition Section of the Code to be specific about cohousing.
 - The density method in Frog Pond West used mapped subdistricts as the basis for the minimum and maximum densities allowed. The subdistricts also were used to geographically reference where certain lot standards applied. One intent was to take the guesswork out of how much density would be designated for-each property and to provide a range of housing units that was simple, matched the overall master planning, and kept the promises made in the Area Plan.
 - The proportional acreage method was used to provide flexibility in determining the density on a portion of a subdistrict. Natural resources, existing homes, and other site-specific conditions were also accommodated in the methodology.

- The Residential Design text was drafted using a set of principles called the Ten Essentials, which were now in the specific language of the Development Code. He highlighted several of these key principles as follows:
 - The new Code was intentional about having a strong relationship between the street life and various elements of the semi-public space of the home, such as the house front, front door and entryways, and front yard. This relationship provided a connection and greater safety for children playing in the front yard. The aesthetic of the homes was more like the house on the left in Slide 16.
 - Garages were regulated for the same reason: to create a quality streetscape. The text provided maximums for garage widths as part of the front façade, as well as restricting how close the garage door could be to the front of the house. The garage door needed to be recessed for the smallest of lots.
 - The Residential Design Standards worked as a package of requirements for facades facing streets and pedestrian connections and trails, also known as “enhanced elevations.” Specific elements required for the front facades included: a minimum 10 percent window requirement; articulation and interest, meaning a portion needed to be offset, have bay windows, or a roof form to provide variety; a design menu requiring 5 of the 17 options be used to add detailing and variation; and house plan variety, so that no two adjacent or opposite homes could have the same façade.
 - During its Code briefing, City Council raised a question about the 10 percent minimum window requirement.
 - In addition to the Residential Design Standards, there were four ways to comply with the actual layout of Small Lots in the Small Lot subdistricts: main entrances face a pedestrian green, cluster housing, alleys, or street-facing garages recessed from the front of the home.
- A lot of discussion regarded the Boeckman Rd and Stafford Rd frontages, which needed to be a welcoming front door to Frog Pond West, but the reality was private lots and yards formed the edge on the north side of Boeckman Rd and the west side of Stafford Rd. The solution was to design the public part of the street cross-section in concert with the private land that would be comprised of a landscaped buffer tract and required ornamental wall. The consistent brick wall with an ornamental railing on top would be interrupted by the required pedestrian connections, street grid, and the school district property frontage.
 - A similar approach was used on the Boeckman Creek frontages where a see-through fence painted in dark colors, similar to Villebois fencing, was required to be more compatible with the natural setting adjacent to it.
- The project team did not add any new regulations for tree preservation, but provided guidance for how site planning could work with the existing tree groves and how to integrate trees in with development. The City’s existing tree preservation regulations would apply to Frog Pond West just as they did in the rest of the city.
- One vision for Frog Pond West was having a close physical and visual relationship to the broad Boeckman Creek Corridor, which would have a public trail. The standard stated the streets should be oriented to the east and west and terminate not with houses or fences at the end, but with an openness to the creek corridor as shown in Slide 24.
- The Street Demonstration Plan was a key tool in knitting the neighborhood together. The local street layout done for the entire neighborhood was considered “guiding, not binding” by the Code, so there was flexibility to work on an individual level with site-specific constraints. However, the standard did require substantially equivalent connectivity, so if an applicant was not going to connect a street in one way, they needed to show how it would be connected or how the pedestrian connectivity was an adequate substitute.
 - He indicated the one crossing of the SROZ on Slide 26, noting the property immediately west of the SROZ could not get access from Boeckman Rd because the access would not meet the City’s standards along Boeckman Rd and would not allow for safe turning movements, especially with the school frontage now directly adjacent. The SROZ crossing was deliberately put into the Street Demonstration Plan to show that particular access could be allowed and would access those lots. The access would also provide public access to the edge of the park should the park go in to the north.

- The proposed street cross-sections were tailored to be consistent with the TSP and included many tree plantings. Green streets were anticipated in Frog Pond West, so the storm drainage would be part of the public street system within the planter strips. While applicants could propose tailored solutions to their property, this was the starting point for that conversation. The Master Plan allowed for a variety of different street cross-sections, including a cross-section for pedestrian connections.
 - In alleys, the homes needed to be set back so that a car could be parked between the garage door and alley without hanging over into the alley.
 - In areas of extremely low traffic volumes, a Woonerf street could be proposed, subject to Development Review Board (DRB) review.
 - Dead end streets would use a hammerhead turn around, as opposed to a cul-de-sac, which benefitted the private properties because hammerheads were smaller than cul-de-sacs.
 - Mr. Neamtzu explained the hammerhead diagram was the standard diagram in the City's Public Works Standards. (Slide 30) In response to Mr. Altman's questions, he said modifications to the hammerhead design were possible, but Staff would consult with Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R) on the design.
- The Boeckman Trail was conceptually aligned at the edge of the neighborhood and up in the living part of the neighborhood, as opposed to down in the creek bottom. The trail would traverse the western edge, come to the bridge and, at some point, come down the hill to take a more creek/forest environment alignment clear to Memorial Park. Eventually, people would be able to go from Memorial Park to Frog Pond West, wrap around to Frog Pond East and South, and return to the high school within a connected trail system.
- Parks and Open Space were an integral part of the Master Plan with two formal parks, natural areas, pedestrian connections, and tree-lined streets forming an integrated network of green spaces.
 - The Master Plan took a different approach to Parks and Open Space than the typical City requirement for individual developments to contribute 25 percent of their land to open space. An analysis found that the Master Plan itself would deliver a minimum of 27 percent open space across the neighborhood.
 - As part of implementing the City's Park Plan, which called for two public parks in this area anyway, the recommendation was that the two parks and the rest of the network would meet the open space standard, which was typically achieved through private implementation elsewhere in the city. The exception was that in the Small Lot Subdistricts, which had greater density and smaller yards for individual homes, 10 percent open space was required. Per the Commission discussion, an applicant could request a reduction or waiver and three factors were defined to guide that decision-making process.
- A Public Lighting Plan was developed and added to the Master Plan to provide a unified set of standards that considered the different lighting levels required for different street types, such as along arterial streets where the most light was needed and small hammerhead turnarounds near Boeckman Creek where the least light would be wanted.
- The Frog Pond West Master Plan also provided guidance for street trees in an effort to provide some coherence as well as a lot of leaves and branches to the neighborhood.
- Consideration was given to gateway features at several levels, including the entrance into Wilsonville near Kahle Rd at Stafford Rd, crossing the Boeckman Bridge, which was a transition to the eastern part of Wilsonville, and smaller neighborhood gateways at Willow Creek Dr and Frog Pond Ln. The Master Plan captured the idea that City gateways needed to be consistent with the other City gateways in the Wilsonville.
- With respect to monuments and signs, the recommendation was not to have individual subdivision monument signs within the Frog Pond West Neighborhood, but rather, a more unified type of subtle signage, such as the gateways and street sign caps would indicate it was all one neighborhood.

Chair Greenfield confirmed there were no questions from the Commission and called for public comment.

Doris Weher, 6855 SW Boeckman Rd, stated this had been a long process, but it had a huge amount of public input and many revisions. She thanked City Staff, Mr. Dills and his staff, and especially Mr. Neamtzu, all of whom had been fabulous. She thanked the Planning Commissioners for the many hours spent listening and reading all the documents. She believed this would be a beautiful plan with its integration of the transportation grid, parks and trails, and various neighborhood densities. The Commission and Staff have done an excellent job.

Andrew Karr, 7700 SW Carriage Oaks Ln, North Wilsonville, appreciated the diligence the Planning Commission, City and Staff had put into this process to make sure the Master Plan projected the beauty and efficiency of the city. He had concerns that were beyond the scope of the project, but could have a direct impact. He recommended installing a two-lane roundabout at the Elligsen Rd/SW 65th/Stafford Rd intersection, similar to the roundabout at the Stafford Rd/Borland Rd intersection.

Commissioner Levit replied a roundabout at that location was already a potential project in the County ~~Transit~~ **Transportation System Plan**.

Don Hanson, OTAK, representing West Hills Development, stated both he and Dan Grimberg of West Hills Development wanted to be on the record with their complete support for the project. They hoped the Planning Commission would recommend forwarding the Master Plan on to City Council for an April 17th public hearing. He thanked the Commission for a great process and for listening and collaborating with them.

Ben Altman, Pioneer Design Group, 9020 SW Washington Square Dr, Portland Or, 97223, stated he was representing Jim Wolfston, the owner of 16 acres in the southwest corner of Subarea 1 who was also present. He noted he had provided written comments to the Commission. He asked about the duplex or attached unit requirement in the Code for Small Lots. The general lot standards for Small Lots of 4,000 to 6,000 sq ft in the Code required 10 percent of the Small Lot area be attached or a duplex, but it did not give any specific lot standards. While an attached unit, like a townhome, would be fine on a 4,000 sq ft lot, a duplex was a tight fit. He requested more clarification or direction in the standards to address that situation, though he did not have any suggestions at this time.

Chair Greenfield asked if the requirement of a maximum permissible footprint and setbacks was sufficient to meet Mr. Altman's need.

Mr. Altman replied the codes he worked with typically had a square foot per unit criteria. If the City wanted duplexes, it would be something like 2,500 or 3,000 sq ft; whatever that number was, but the standard had to be something other than 4,000 or 6,000 sq ft. Otherwise, nothing would be accomplished if each unit required 4,000 sq ft. The unit per lot area had to be a tighter area to gain density. He assumed the City wanted higher density by including duplexes as a variety of housing type and an opportunity for a smaller lot unit mix.

- The other big issue was the infrastructure financing, although they realized it was not finished. Some concerns were regarding how the costs would be proportioned out. For example, the bridge's cost would be proportioned out based on the percentage of traffic from the Frog Pond West Neighborhood, but once the bridge was crossed, 100 percent of the costs went to the frontage properties fronting on Boeckman Rd, which is a drastic change.
 - The 16-acre property in Subarea 1 he was working on had a density range of 66 to 82 units with 1,450 linear feet of street frontage. Adding a turn lane, curb, and sidewalk was one thing, but the 10-ft landscape buffer and decorative brick wall added a significant additional cost to the street design that would be borne by those 66 to 82 units, ranging from \$5,000 to \$8,000 per unit. The developer did not believe that was fair; the cost should be spread out beyond the properties fronting the street.
 - He suggested the City consider the same proportional traffic volume considerations for the improvements because basically, it was a beautification component that added no traffic capacity at all. The cost of the 10-ft buffer and decorative wall should be borne by the entire city or even the entire West Neighborhood, not just the properties fronting on Boeckman Rd. The minimum would be to

spread the costs across the whole neighborhood, but even that would increase the unit costs for something that added no traffic capacity whatsoever.

Chair Greenfield:

- Confirmed that City Council, not the Planning Commission, was responsible for figuring out the funding.
 - Mr. Neamtzu added the City was in the middle of complex negotiations. All of the public input would be closely reviewed and be the subject of additional negotiations, hopefully, resulting in agreements by all parties on how to pay for the infrastructure. Paying for the wall was a new concern this week and not raised in any prior conversations.
 - West Hills Development had proposed the design concept for the wall. The City was seeking a high quality, cohesive, and consistent neighborhood, which drove the Master Plan. The neighborhood should look incredibly attractive.
- Asked what advice City Council would be looking for from the Planning Commission.
 - Mr. Neamtzu replied the Commission could provide helpful direction on high-level policy recommendations regarding whether:
 - Frog Pond West was a place where the City should consider doing something different than done in the past.
 - There was an important public need being met in Frog Pond West that might need different tools, or did the Commissioners have preferences for tools they had seen utilized successfully in other places.
 - The Commission had been provided a memorandum outlining many possible approaches. A reimbursement district should be used with the public fronting the money and payback over time by the developers or was that cost an obligation of the development community. The Boeckman Rd improvements would not be needed without the improvements to the Frog Pond West Neighborhood.
 - He noted the City's long-standing policy has been outlined as part of these ongoing negotiations, but he was hesitant to go into any detail, since it was still all up in the air.
 - Believed the question of equity was very important and that the Commission should have input about it, but he had more questions than ideas right now. One fundamental principle was how to strike a balance between the aesthetic improvement to the town and the property value to the neighborhood, both of which had strong implications for apportioning the costs. He did not know exactly how the apportionment should be devised, but he firmly believed there needed to be an apportionment. The City needed to take into account the broader impact of beautification and the quality of life in town, which were not separate from, but rather an overlay on, the neighborhood's interests.
- Asked if Wilsonville had been in a similar situation with other embedded developments where this principle might have been considered or worked in other areas.
 - Mr. Neamtzu replied the general City policy has often been that the half-street requirement was the obligation of the development community when the development fronted on a road like Boeckman Rd. The City could legally negotiate 24 ft of improvements, regardless of the right-of-way width, through the development review process. Going beyond the half-street improvement into offsite improvements got into disproportionate takings and Dolan arguments, which were all legal aspects of land use and development that became very complicated very quickly.
 - With Boeckman Rd, the developer 's required 24-ft improvement would go out toward the street median, while the City was responsible for the entire south side of the entire Boeckman Rd frontage. The City was already working with the school district to improve the entire corner and had significant resources dedicated to improving the Four Corners intersection with streetlights, widening, new sidewalks, ramps, striping, etc. Development paying for that 24-ft of improvements was the City's long standing policy and standard starting point for negotiations with all new development.
 - Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager, clarified the Code measurement was 24 ft from face of curb, which provided the two travel lanes of roadway required to provide travel to and from

the development. This City's standard has been enforced for both residential and commercial development for the 15 years he has been at the City. Everything behind the curb, such as landscaping, sidewalks, streetlights, etc., was an improvement required as part of the development process, for which the developer was responsible on their side of the street, but not as part of the 24 ft.

- Mr. Neamtzu noted the Infrastructure Funding Plan technical memorandum from the Leland Consulting Group included a diagram (Figure 2, Appendix D) showing a cross-section of the entire street with a yellow highlighted portion that illustrated the City's standard practice for the developer's obligation.
 - He confirmed beautification elements included more than transportation elements, such as the planting strip, enhanced sidewalks, and ornamental wall, and were the property owner/developer's responsibility as shown in the diagram.
- Understood Mr. Altman was raising a principle that these elements went beyond what would necessarily fall to a property owner because of the development's size and the City's need to make it look good. The question, as he saw it, was whether the City had a responsibility to help offset the cost of these elements.
 - Mr. Neamtzu stated the City had no obligation to offset the cost of private subdivision walls that served as property line fences for private homes. He emphasized there was no public obligation there.
- Replied that would seem clear and asked about the planting strip.
 - Mr. Neamtzu explained the 10-ft area outside of the wall was a public utility easement for a wide variety of undergrounded public utilities going in along Boeckman Rd that needed to be accessible. In addition, the 10-ft area provided more privacy for residents, as well as separation and buffering for the homes from the roadway noise.
 - Mr. Adams recalled the developer of the old mobile home court property provided the fence facing Parkway Rd and the 10- to 20-ft landscape buffer between the right-of-way and the fence, as well as choosing to create offset lots from the busy road; none of which was required by the City. The 10- to 30-ft wide linear greens fronting on Boeckman, Tooze, and Graham Ferry Roads were part of the Villebois Master Plan. The nice brick and wrought iron fences in Villebois were never a sore point for the developers building homes along those roads.
- Stated, while Mr. Altman might be technically correct to say these beautification measures would not provide any significant direct benefits to the abutting lots, there were certainly many indirect benefits to the property owner in terms of property value, attractiveness, resalability, and the pleasure in living in a beautiful place. These other benefits needed to be taken into account along with or the absence of any direct benefits.
- Urged, however, that the Council to take into consideration the general public benefit of doing a good job, particularly along the approach to Frog Pond West on Boeckman Rd. The City needed to look at this issue sensitively and carefully.

Commissioner Postma pointed out that public comment had not been closed. Acknowledging indications from West Hills for comment, he said he was amenable to hearing further testimony from West Hills Development on the issue, since they had created the dilemma.

Dan Grimberg, West Hills Development, stated West Hills has been very involved in Frog Pond and appreciated all the hard work that gone into the Master Plan. He had called Mr. Neamtzu earlier today to say that West Hills Development was 100 percent supportive of getting the Master Plan approved, adding it had been a great process and acknowledging that Staff had listened to the developers' concerns and made some revisions. While West Hills was concerned about the finance plan, he understood it would not be discussed at tonight's the public hearing. However, since it had come up, he felt it was appropriate to provide input from the developer's perspective.

- City staff had been very open to their concerns in their three meetings so far, although they had not yet reached a workable plan. He cited West Hills' involvement in four other UGB expansion areas noting such developments were unique because of the small properties were master planned as one development. In other areas, West Hills Development combined two or three 50-acre properties and created a nice master

plan within the master planned community, but Frog Pond was very unique in that the average property size was five acres.

- West Hills Development was looking for a fair mechanism to finance the infrastructure improvements, which they did believe were beautifications in many instances, such as the medians and wide landscaping. As an example, West Hills was in contract to buy four pieces of property, the largest of which was five acres. The combined frontage on Boeckman Rd was about 1,300 lineal ft, which was about half of Frog Pond. Under the current program, West Hills would be responsible for a half-street improvement, including the median, landscaping, and brick wall. He confirmed West Hills did propose a brick wall as an appropriate solution for providing privacy, instead of an earlier proposal to have the front door fronting on Boeckman Rd.
- West Hills also wanted a nice community, but also a fair way to share the cost. In a letter to Mr. Neamtzu, written in late February, West Hills proposed that every lot in Frog Pond West pay roughly a 1/500th share of the Boeckman Rd improvements as part of the development fee. The Frog Pond West residences took their driveway access from a local subdivision street and not from Boeckman Rd directly. Boeckman Rd was used by everybody in the area; therefore, West Hills was asking that all lots in Frog Pond West pay an equal share of the Boeckman Rd and Stafford Rd improvements. West Hills believed that was fair, as this was the same apportionments in other areas, such as in North Bethany, South Cooper Mountain, Bonnie Slope, and River Terrace.
- He contended Villebois was entirely different, as it was a large-scale development that had a master developer for its hundreds of acres and thousands of homes. In contrast, Frog Pond West involved small-scale development so the infrastructure costs needed to be spread across a broader range of homes rather than just a small portion of the development.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked what West Hill's proposal did for the existing property owners who would not likely see development, such as the church property that had frontage subject to the proposal.
 - Mr. Grimberg noted the roads were funded through collected fees. When private development built roads, it received credits against the fees normally paid with each house, or, the money was collected, and as it became available, it could be used to do improvements, like those along the church property if the church was not going to redevelop.
 - The entire cost of the Boeckman Rd and Stafford Rd improvements would be totaled and divided by the number of lots in the neighborhood.
- Confirmed the methodology worked in Frog Pond West because the improvements were not slated for all of the lots.

Don Hanson, OTAK, believed Mr. Grimberg's comments were pretty thorough. He observed a framework plan for financing was included in the report this evening and confirmed with Staff there was time between now and City Council to discuss it further.

Commissioner Levit:

- Understood a timing issue was involved if the cost was to be spread over all the houses because the wall would be built and Stafford Rd developed long before all the houses were built so, the money might never show.
 - Mr. Grimberg replied the money would come in, but agreed it was a timing issue. He explained in other areas, incremental improvements were done because the whole road did not have to be built up front. In West Hill's case, they did not need to improve all of Boeckman Rd when they developed their 50 lots. Mr. Wolfston's development might trigger a small improvement somewhere; perhaps interim turn lanes might be provided until the collected fees were adequate to fund the major improvements.
 - These discussions usually started out with the idea that the roads would all be built up front, which raised the question of where the money was going to come from. There was no money. Typically, a city told the developer to make the improvements and they would be reimbursed down the

road. The developer wanted to know how far down the road and asked about the city's money, but the city had no money. There was no big pot of money.

- He clarified that, in other areas, doing the improvements incrementally typically did not result in a hodge-podge of road improvements and constant construction for years. While it was a long discussion, incremental improvements did work.
- Asked about the system development charges (SDC) for the south side of Boeckman Rd from Meadows and the other developments there.
 - Mr. Neamtzu confirmed the City would contribute SDC money, which has already been collected, towards its obligation to construct the entire south side of Boeckman Rd.
 - He confirmed that 14 percent of the road development was for the bridge.

Commissioner Springall observed that apportioning the funding by number of households would seem to add a higher cost on the Small Lots, whereas apportioning the funding by lot size added a higher cost to the larger lots. He asked if the Commission should give some direction on that matter or if Council determined that policy.

- Mr. Neamtzu stated it was impossible to prove that a large lot had more impact on the system, since one person could live in a 50,000 sq ft house and 14 people in a 2,000 sq ft house. Because of the need to normalize the impact, it was calculated on a per dwelling unit basis.
 - While the idea was attractive on the surface, he had never seen a study able to demonstrate that impact, nor could they demonstrate that bigger lots would have a bigger impact in Frog Pond West, and therefore, should legally pay a higher proportion of the cost. He was not certain the idea was legally defensible.

Commissioner Postma:

- Understood current conversations were occurring with the owners in the hopes that they would come up with a methodology between them to equitably distribute the funds.
 - Mr. Neamtzu clarified the City was engaging with individuals, floating ideas back and forth, and trying to find common ground. Once both West Hills and the City were in a comfortable place, Staff would then talk with Mr. Altman's group, who has been involved in the infrastructure interviews.
 - It was a complicated matter. Not everyone agreed and people wanted different things, but at some point, the City would have to say, "This is as far as we're able to go financially." The unintended consequence might be disagreement or an inability to bridge the gap, and the project might not happen for a while. That was the reality.
 - He reminded that the Commission discussed the per door costs during its density discussions and the need to pay for the infrastructure projects. The Planning Commission was told in no uncertain terms and repeatedly through the testimony on the Area Plan that this was "no big deal" and "to build it and they will come." Now, at this point in the process, it was not easy.
- Suggested including the word "equitable" in the Infrastructure Plan section in hopes that those who came to the table could have a reasonable conversation about it. The simple solution might be to punt with some idea of equity.
 - While 'equitable' was about the same word as 'fair,' lawyers like himself preferred to use 'equitable.' To him, 'equitable' tried to encapsulate the concepts of fair and some semblance of equality, while 'fair' was a subjective term. However, the key was how did one measure equal. Equitable attempted to be a little more objective, although it seldom was.
 - Mr. Hanson added and possibly 'proportional'. It started steering toward the amount of land one owned and the amount of land one was developing.
- Believed that could be incorporated by saying the apportionment should be with an eye towards an equitable distribution proportionally among the lots. However, it begged the question that Mr. Neamtzu raised, how did one really measure the impacts, if that was the intent.

Commissioner Mesbah agreed the element of equity was completely missing here, noting the issue of takings raised by Mr. Neamtzu. The City had no obligation to annex this land, so the fact that the City was developing

the area provided value added to the landowners, developers, and so forth. That part of the equity also needed to be counted. The City had the option to require that it be done a certain way, which cost money. The wall was an aesthetic element, but so were all the rest of the design standards, which cost the developers and property purchasers money. The City was saying that in order for the City to provide the services, "This is what we want it to look like", which was part of the equity.

Chair Greenfield observed it was a cost/benefit analysis. The cost to the City and homeowner needed to be balanced with the benefit to the City and homeowner.. It was a complex matter that he was not sure the Planning Commission could do anything about, but he might attend the City Council meeting when the issue came up, as he had some sensibility about the issue.

Mr. Neamtzu appreciated Commissioner Postma's simple and elegant idea.

Commissioner Springall:

- Noted the density designation of Subdistrict 3 in Table 3 of Appendix C-4 should be corrected to state R10, not R3 as noted. The R3 Zone did not exist in Frog Pond West.
- Asked to include former Commissioner Marta McGuire and current Commissioner Kamran Mesbah on the Acknowledgements Page in Appendix A-1.
 - Mr. Neamtzu said he had caught that earlier and Staff would make the noted corrections.
- Expressed concern about the lighting levels shown on the Public Lighting Plan (Slide 37) with respect to pedestrian connections, trailheads, hammerheads, and their connection to the creek. He confirmed the pedestrian connections had the lowest lighting levels, but noted conflicting requirements regarding the trailheads and hammerheads and their connection to the creek given concerns about personal safety and the wildlife issue. Lighting adjacent to an SROZ should be much dimmer and nonintrusive because wildlife would primarily use the creek corridor at night, and not people. He could not visualize how bright the lighting would be, but it should not be to the same standard as the roadway lighting.
- Asked for clarification about what trailhead lighting meant before he suggested any potential changes.
 - Mr. Dills noted the intent statements on Page 80 of the Master Plan discussed pedestrian, trailhead, and path lighting. The bottom paragraph addressed the SROZ lighting noting that the SROZ buffers and trailhead areas would be the lighting Zone LZ 1 as specified in the City reference provided, which called out specifically the unique character and wildlife considerations. He confirmed the language accomplished the outcome Commissioner Springall was suggesting. The project team was comfortable with the lighting standard accommodating the SROZ.

Chair Greenfield asked what the lighting standard was for the pedestrian connections.

- Mr. Neamtzu explained typically, it was more of a transition lighting zone with a smaller scale pedestrian light. The parks in Villebois had a similar lighting fixture. Pedestrian lighting was at a smaller scale of 10 ft, rather than 12- to 15-ft high, so it was closer to the ground to provide comparable ground level lighting for pedestrians. The lights were likely placed a little further apart than safety lighting for cars, but still provided consistent lighting without dark patches.
- Bollards were not recommended due to the high likelihood of vandalism and serious maintenance issues in these types of areas, especially along trails.
- He described the transition of lighting from the dark of the canyon for wildlife to the lighting of the trailhead zone and then to the regular street lighting.

Chair Greenfield stated for the record that he strongly supporting spreading the cost of the Boeckman Rd and Stafford Rd improvements to the whole neighborhood. He agreed with Mr. Altman's argument on Page 3 of his memorandum that it was not reasonable or equitable for a limited number of lots to be burdened with this large additional cost.

- He agreed with Commissioner Levit that the Master Plan had come together pretty well. It was an excellent document and he recognized the input from the Commission and the community.

Andrew Karr commented that given the discussion on spreading the cost equitably across housing units, he reminded there was a minimum and a maximum, so the City needed to be careful to balance the SDC Fund every year. If the cost was spread across 571 units, but only 452 units were built, then not enough SDCs would be collected to pay for the improvements.

- Mr. Neamtzu noted Mr. Karr was a Budget Committee member and a former DRB member and was very familiar with the City's process. He clarified the project team's methodology assumed an 80 percent build out for the purposes of spreading the cost across the neighborhood, which would address Mr. Karr's concern.

Commissioner Millan thanked the City for including the Dark Sky elements in the lighting piece. Regarding the equitable distribution issue, it was good to hear there has been some contingency planning, and the City was not looking at spreading the cost out over all the possible things that could be built. She commented it had been good and interesting process, and it was remarkable to see the interplay between the landowners', developers', and City's interests coming together.

Chair Greenfield thanked the consultants and Staff. He confirmed there were no further comments and closed the public testimony. He called for any further comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Postma suggested including in the motion references to items the Commission felt should be changed or included, such as potential inclusion of language in the infrastructure funding portion regarding a reference to equitable allocation for things that benefit the entire project. He wanted to be sure the Commission consented to that inclusion.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, Deputy City Attorney, advised on how the motion should be stated.

The Commission consented to the inclusion of the word "equitable" in the Infrastructure Financing Plan.

Commissioner Postma moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Resolution LP17-0001 Frog Pond West Master Plan, associated amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Text and Map, Planning and Land Development Ordinance Text, and SROZ Overlay Zone, to City Council, correcting the density designation in Appendix C-4, Table 3, Subdistrict 3, to R10, not R3, and including a reference within the Infrastructure Financing Plan to equitable cost allocation for improvements that benefit the entire Frog Pond Development. Commissioner Mesbah seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Greenfield closed the public hearing.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Town Center Plan Kick-off Event Update - Miranda Bateschell

Miranda Bateschell, Long-Range Planning Manager, reported on the Town Center plan Kick-Off Event held on Tuesday, February 28th, in City Hall with these key comments:

- Activities for engaging families prior to the formal events starting included project boards and maps, where people could place stickers to show where they lived and where they went in the Town Center. There was also a visioning exercise using a card that said, "My future Town Center is _____."
- The consultants' presentation began with a review of the existing conditions in the Town Center and trends the consultants were seeing in town centers across the country. In presenting the different alternatives, the consultants asked whether these trends were part of the attendees' vision and which pieces citizens were interested in seeing or not seeing in the Town Center.
- The approximately 80 attendees, both children and adults, then broke into seven small discussion groups, including a youth table and a Spanish-speaking group. At the end of the event, many very good ideas were reported out and people were excited about the project.

- She explained that the break out groups were being recorded so everything discussed would be part of the record. Videos were also made of the small group report outs. As with any other map-based activities, Staff has offered to do the same facilitated exercise at schools or with other groups. All of this information, including the survey results, would be compiled into a report for the Task Force and then for the joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting as part of the public input received to date in helping to inform a vision statement and goals for the Town Center project.
- She encouraged the Commissioners to take the survey and share it with their network. Within two days, the survey had 41 responses, so she looked forward to seeing the response by the end of the week. The survey was available in both English and Spanish, and other translations or resources were available upon request, so anyone could take the survey, which would be on the Town Center project website until the end of March.

Feedback, suggestions for future events and comments about any key issues that arose within the Commissioners' particular focus groups were as follows:

- The Kick-Off Event was a productive start and there was a sense that the community felt involved, which was important.
- The enthusiasm of an engaging young woman from the high school, who was on the Task Force, was contagious. Her input on how her age group wanted a Town Center that created spaces where the kids could socialize and interact with different age groups was an important piece beyond the typical shopping element. Her energy about creating a space in Town Center and what it could be for her age group provided a very enlightening perspective.
- One area business owner was willing and open to seeing change in the area, while another area business owner was completely against it.
- It was an engaging process and the consultants did an excellent job, especially in bringing back information from the small groups better than other consultants have done over the years. The consultants probably would have done even more, but there were time constraints.
- All the excellent charts on the mind map drawn by Consultant Alex Dupey from MIG would be captured in high resolution and included as part of the report.
- Bringing in the bilingual perspective and inviting both kids and families to contribute was appreciated.
- Having multiple means to gather feedback and connect with people at the Kick-Off Event was valuable and encouraging for community engagement. Stepping away from the traditional open house event was beneficial.
- The Kick-Off Event was well done, especially the variety of citizen input and attendance.
- Staff was aware that the Question of the Week on the website only allowed one choice instead of all one might want as requested. They had been troubleshooting the problem for about four days and identified the problem. In theory, it had been fixed, but it would be helpful if someone who had not already responded tested it and let Staff know if it was working now. Deleting computer cookies might eradicate the problem.

Commissioner Springall noted the French Prairie Bridge online survey closing in a few days and he encouraged the Commissioners to fill in their comments soon.

B. 2017 PC Work Program

Miranda Bateschell, Long-Range Planning Manager, stated the work program was already outdated with the Transit Master Plan now going to public hearing in May with the work session in April.

She expected to bring the 2016 Housing Report forward next month and perhaps, an update on the Task Force's work on the Town Center Plan.

Commissioner Levit reported seeing outdoor burning last week behind the Wiedeman House and asked about the City's policy on outdoor burning within the city limits.

- Commissioner Hurley recalled asking TVF&R about a similar situation and learning outdoor burning was allowed in unincorporated sections of the city.
- Ms. Bateschell said she would have one of the planners follow up with Commissioner Levit about the City's outdoor burning policy

Commissioner Levit asked how one could find out when a project would be on the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). The sidewalk project at the end of his street, Willamette Way West, was in the Pedestrian Master Plan. The sidewalk on the east side of the street was not complete. The sidewalk was a Safe Route to School and right across the entrance to Graham Oaks, but there was no way for people to stay out of the busy road. He inquired when the sidewalk project might be done. He could not find any recent information on the City's website.

- Ms. Bateschell believed all the Pedestrian Master Plan projects had been transferred to the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). She would find out from the engineers when the Willamette Way West project was scheduled and follow up with Commissioner Levit.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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