

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2018  
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Minutes as approved at  
the November 14, 2018  
PC meeting*

**Minutes**

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**

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

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Peter Hurley, Simon Springall, Phyllis Millan, and Ron Heberlein. Kamran Mesbah arrived shortly after Roll Call.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Zach Weigel, Mike McCarty and Jennifer Scola

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

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

**II. LEGISLATIVE HEARING**

A. Boones Ferry Park Master Plan (McCarty)  
(Public Hearing to be continued to a date certain of November 14, 2018)

Chair Greenfield read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:04 pm.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, noted Parks and Recreation Director Mike McCarty, who requested the hearing be continued to November 14, 2018, the next Planning Commission meeting. Mr. McCarty had been working with technical experts on last minutes refinements to the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan. Staff would do its best to get the full Plan distributed in advance of seven days prior to the hearing, as discussed in September, since the Commission had not seen the full body of text for the Master Plan. The Master Plan would also be published on the City's website one week prior to the public hearing. In the meantime, any questions or concerns from the public would be fielded by Director McCarty.

Mike McCarty confirmed Staff would get the plan to the Commissioners early, as the consultants had said they would have their final rendition of the plan to Staff by Friday, October 19<sup>th</sup>. He apologized that the plan had not been given to the Commission in June or July as originally planned. Staff wanted to present a document that Staff, the Commission, and the taxpayers were proud of; therefore, he requested that the hearing be continued to November.

Chair Greenfield called for public comments. There were none.

Mr. Neamtzu acknowledged Mr. Benson, who was on the Parks Board, was in the audience and noted the continuance might be a surprise to him. He apologized to Mr. Benson and noted that the Commission could receive testimony, if he had any. The hearing would only be closed following any citizen testimony, which would be put in the record for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider in November.

Mr. Benson stated from the audience that if there were any modifications to the plan, he had not seen them.

Mr. Neamtzu noted it was probably best to refrain from commenting on a plan that was in flux.

**Commissioner Millan moved to continue the public hearing on the Boones Ferry Park to November 14, 2018 date certain. Commissioner Postma seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

### III. WORK SESSIONS

#### A. Town Center Plan (Bateschell)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Manager, reminded that the last updates to the Town Center Plan were presented to the Commission in August, which included comments from the community and task force, design and development details, and feedback from the Commission. The updates being presented tonight would provide more details, new and updated elements, highlights of the development feasibility analysis, and a traffic analysis. She introduced project team members, Alex Dupey, Project Manager, MIG Consulting and Associate Planner, Jennifer Scola. She noted that Staff had a number of questions for the Commission, which were included in the Staff report and PowerPoint presentation.

Alex Dupey, presented the Wilsonville Town Center Plan via PowerPoint, which included a review of proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, revised zoning standards and design guidelines, draft implementation measures, the development feasibility analysis, and next steps. The presentation also included an overview of the draft implementation measures, which would be discussed in more depth at the next meeting.

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

- Was the language in Attachment A.3 (Section 4.155(.02).G) about removing the distance maximum for off-site parking (Slide 7) meant to convey that off-site parking would be allowed anywhere within the Town Center District, or that there would be no distance limit to how far off-site parking could be, including outside of the Town Center zoning area. For example, in a gigantic parking structure across the pedestrian bridge.
- The idea was that each building would still require a certain amount of onsite parking. One space per dwelling unit had become standard for mixed-used type areas. Analyses done throughout the region showed that places like outer Portland were achieving parking ratios of 0.7. While there were different amenities in Wilsonville, even some of the suburbs were getting less than one and the team believed one space per dwelling unit for Town Center would be appropriate.
- The distance was up for debate should the Commission wanted to put a caveat on it to remain within Town Center. A developer could lease an existing surface parking lot and use it for overflow until it was developed. However, when the pedestrian bridge was connected, SMART said its parking garage, which was 40 percent full, could be used for overflow parking if it was connected well with transit. The Commission needed to consider whether to allow the off-site parking distance just within Town Center or someplace else. The goal was to right size parking as much as possible, to avoid overbuilding it and getting the same type of development pattern seen today, which was a lot of unused parking.
- Tigard's mixed-use standards allowed a 25 percent reduction within mixed-use buildings. Wilsonville would want to evaluate Tigard's performance of those standards as new mixed-use buildings were just coming online. The idea was to maximize the amount of building footprint, while still providing on-street parking and acknowledging that fitting more uses into a space would reduce the amount of parking

needed. The recent Holland development in Orenco included a structure with one parking space per dwelling unit.

- With parking, there was no magic bullet, so cities try to right size the parking as much as possible to provide flexibility. The benefit with Town Center was that there was a lot of available parking now that could be used early on. Even if parking minimums were reduced for future development, there was a lot of parking that could be used as overflow until Town Center developed where structured types of uses could be built.
- Structured parking, like in Hillsboro and other locations, was rarely built by public agencies, but often developed through a public/private partnership or paid for on the private side. It was a risky proposition for a city to purchase a parcel and build a structure on it. The feasibility analysis also addressed who would pay for structured parking.
- The parking structure in Lake Oswego had a wrap format where the shops were on the outside, which a lot of people liked. A study about utilization of parking rates in downtown Lake Oswego helped inform decisions about the right number of parking spaces needed based on the mixed-use project, and there was a reduction in the initial number of parking spaces required, by about 20 to 25 percent. Lake Oswego's structure was considered a good example of parking.
- Lake Oswego's structure was essentially funded through the city's urban renewal and bank deposits made by developers. Instead of building their own spaces, developers paid so much money per space into a fund that helped pay for the structure. Opinions differed about whether the parking structure worked well in Lake Oswego.
- Over dedicating parking spaces for specific businesses might be the bigger problem in Town Center. Spaces were marked for a specific business in Town Center. The goal was to support mixed uses by allowing people to park once then go to several different places. Having time limits or designating certain spaces for shorter visits might be more beneficial.
- A fully utilized parking structure was successful. If the parking structure did not perform properly, residents would park on the street in front of retail building spaces for days at a time, so perhaps time limitations on street parking should be considered.
- On-street parking was a critical element for a successful main street, but with that came parking management. In the City of Renton, WA, the biggest issue in the downtown area was that employees were parking right in front of their businesses. That city's lack of enforcement to make parked cars move after the two-hour time limit created parking problems. Part of the implementation strategy would be to develop enforcement of both on-street and off-street public parking, which would need to be addressed as the area became more active in the future.
- The Commission should also bear in mind the general concept of concurrency. Some businesses that come later might be profiting, or conversely, paying more than businesses that were there earlier, and yet, that must be traded with wanting to encourage development in the earlier years. He wanted to see more detail on the parking supply management concept and how that could be done in a business friendly and development equitable way.
- The Lake Oswego parking structure was a good example because it was the first corner in a revamped downtown. It took a long time to get that project going and determine the right size parking, how to pay for it, and how it was to be managed over time. Lake Oswego was just starting to deal with those issues as development came in and it was the first project to use private and public money. The question was how to deal with that over time as the area matured.
- The parking in Lake Oswego worked because the parking was there. The concern was that allowing off-site parking at SMART and providing a regular shuttle service would be inconvenient and discourage people from coming to the area.
- Town Center was a large area. If someone in the southwest quadrant leased parking in the northwest quadrant, their patrons would have a good distance to travel to get from parking to the business, which would not make sense if the City was trying to encourage people to be there.
- People were not expected to park across I-5 as the SMART parking lot would not be the first option if development came in tomorrow.

- The proposed parking requirements were trying to provide some flexibility to achieve more of a master development scale as opposed to just a single site scale. However, the project team could put more thought into what the right distance was and whether there should be modifications. No one would walk a mile to their car. The team just wanted the Commission to consider some flexibility for future development.
- From its center, Town Center was a quarter mile in any direction, so the entire area across was probably a bit more than a half mile. On-site parking requirements would still exist. The issue was more about spill over. If a developer had a tight site and could make the pro-forma and financing work, the City would allow for off-site parking by providing options for some creativity with regard to parking, at least initially. As more development came in, parking would get tighter. However, the first development in should have options since they were taking a risk.
- Flexibility should not undermine the City's investment in other systems, like transit. If everyone could drive to the store, no one would use transit. Wilsonville was trying to create a transit-oriented and walkable town center. Designing the area to be heavily car oriented would undermine all of the City's investment in other modes of transportation. Flexibility needed to address different uses and different populations. Someone who wanted to pick up dry cleaning on the way to work would need to find close five-minute parking. However, someone who would be window shopping would not need to go from store to store in their car. The design needed to dissuade people from doing that in a way that encouraged them to park in one place and catch a shuttle.
- The current standards resulted in the existing land use patterns in Town Center; however, the other piece would be the urban form requirements for where parking would be located, particularly along Main Street and other areas. Parking needed to be provided so people could park once and stay to enjoy the area, but a pleasant experience was also needed so they enjoyed walking around. There was a balance between making sure the parking was in the right location and that it was accessible for the right types of uses.
- The SMART transit system could be very nimble and flexible, which would support the Town Center Plan and policy decisions. Staff spoke with SMART earlier today about changing technology and ideas regarding shuttles in Town Center to access various locations easily. SMART was an asset that other cities in the region did not have. The Commission should keep that in mind going through the process and consider what the City wanted from transit's enhancements or investments; items that could be implemented to work toward on the transit side to help support some of the policy decisions.

The Commission discussed the proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code as follows with responses from the project team as noted:

- The language in Section 4.155(.02).D on Page 141 of 267 regarding multi-use parking would be cleaned up. The idea behind the use of two "excepts" in the sentence was to have a 25 percent parking reduction for uses within a mixed-use building, not citywide, but focused on future development in Town Center.
- Section 4.155(.02).E, which discussed the owners of two different parcels or two different uses utilizing the same parking area, would permit shared parking as long as the uses did not overlap or that parking study supported the overlap. No changes were made to that existing City standard. Section 4.155(.02).E would apply for two land owners who wanted to share their parking space regardless of the type of building, while Section D would set the requirement for the number of spaces by the building and a shared parking component would be added. There was the number and then how it was used.
- Prohibiting drive through lanes on mixed use did not make sense in the southwest corner of Town Center, as it could be marketable property for a use with a drive through. Using a bank as an example of a drive through use seemed strange. Considering the space requirements, a single, drive-through lane might work along an alley in a mixed-use zone. Prohibiting drive through lanes might be too restrictive. Restricting queuing lanes instead might allow for businesses with a single, drive-through window. The standard was found on Pages 116 and 128 of 267.
- The existing drive-throughs in Town Center were challenging for pedestrians because the lanes were immediately adjacent to sidewalks. Design standards that put the drive to the side or back and kept queuing on site, away from pedestrian amenities could be considered.

- Prohibiting drive through windows from facing public streets should be revisited as some smaller roads and alleyways might still be public. (Page 128 of 267) Such restrictions might prevent a property from being marketable.
- The proposed side and rear setbacks in the Main Street District seemed too small to encourage the type of restaurant development that the City wanted. Some businesses in Bend have outdoor seating at the back of the building, so the 0-ft rear setback should be more flexible.
- A 20-ft setback on the street side would accommodate outdoor seating with a 12-foot sidewalk; however, flexibility on the rear setback could work well.
- Regarding the requirement that buildings must be habitable, Mr. Dupey clarified that a second story could be residential or office space. The requirement was meant to avoid single-story buildings, including single stories with a false front. There would be no minimum residential requirements for a mixed-use building, which would likely be multiple stories anyway. However, there should be some minimum residential requirements for residential buildings on the north portion of Main Street to ensure the desired density and quality were achieved.
- Stating that second stories had to be habitable indicated they had to be residential. Changing the word “habitable” to something like “designed for occupancy” was recommended. The City did not want a vacant second story that was not a finished space that could be rented.
- The Commission could determine if second story spaces could include storage or warehouse space. A two-story building built to spec before the office market needed space could be filled by allowing a business to move in to the ground floor, while they figure out how to finish out the second floor, whether it goes to housing or office. The key was to make sure the façade met the desired design standards as opposed to the use standards.
- Allowing an additional story for affordable housing projects could result in a lack of predictability and continuity as to where the higher buildings would be located.
- The Commission discussed organic quality at the last meeting, and heights could be organic. The Commission should consider whether it wanted a max envelope or to allow some flexibility for a housing project. Stories would not be added to a building after development. The developer would provide a certain percentage of affordable housing that would allow them a height or density bonus
- After a certain height, structures become more expensive to build due to requirements for a heavy-duty steel structure and reinforced concrete. Developments with maximum heights were visually very boring because all the development would be built to the maximum. A dynamic silhouette was part of the visual interest that varied heights provided.
- Because of the way affordable housing financing works, the City might need a standard regarding a certain percentage.
- Any developer wanting the density bonus would need to demonstrate the benefit to the community.

Discussion regarding how the Development Feasibility Analysis (Attachment B) might impact the Town Center Vision (Slide 24) included the following key comments:

- Parking load and traffic were clearly different between Wilsonville and Orenco Station given the contrast between offices and housing. The pie charts demonstrated the mix of uses and that Town Center was a desirable place for people to be, which was why the area was being built out. (Slides 10 and 11)
- The return on investment (ROI) in the feasibility study was based on the current land owner doing the developing. Developers would only be interested in new development if it would result in a better return on their investment than the existing buildings, parking, etc. Was there a comparative analysis on how the ROI would compare to the current ROI?
- Leland would need to do a bit more analysis regarding site specific locations. A big box retailer would have different questions than a strip mall. Larger developments and vacant land would easily fit in the first four options where there was a lot of unused parking. A lot of infill could occur before developers would have to consider tearing down a building in order to redevelop.
- Given the feasibility analysis, it was difficult to see how the great vision for a Main Street would work out. Main Street did not currently exist. It was a section of a parking lot, but since it was partly adjacent to a

strip mall it could have potential if the strip mall redeveloped as one side of the Main Street. Everything else was auxiliary, because the Main Street would be the pull and the heart of Town Center.

- The implementation strategy would include catalyst projects to start to change that. For example, was the extension of Main Street from the park to Wilsonville Rd a key catalyst project that both the landowner and City want to embark on? That type of investment would open opportunities for reconsidering how the adjacent properties would develop over time. Doing that would take both public and private money. Infill to the north where existing vacant spaces would not take that investment could happen today. In the coming weeks, the Task Force would be identifying what catalyst projects could kick off development and those would be discussed with the Planning Commission.
- There had been a number of meetings between the project team and land owners, as well as conversations by phone. An Economic Summit would be held on October 11<sup>th</sup>, which would include a panel that would talk about the feasibility results and the City's incentives and strategies that could be employed. Land owners continued to be engaged, but somewhat peripherally. Business and land owners in the area hold a lot of their business decisions close to their chest, but they still answered Staff's phone calls and the dialogue continued. Once the plan was adopted, people might feel more interested or secure about how the City's vision would be implemented.
- Land owners would likely be reluctant to do something on their own as opposed to a group taking the Plan on together. Having the City should try to facilitate that relationship would be ideal.
- The property owners definitely expressed interest in the increased opportunities the proposed Town Center Plan provided compared to the existing Town Center Plan and the existing Code for Town Center. Often, until a plan was actually adopted, not many business plans were made or detailed discussions had around that.
- The City needed a joint vision and everyone needed to see the new plan as a joint opportunity.
- The driving factor would be the rent premiums. Discussions regarding housing development have been about not increasing multi-family units, but the feasibility analysis recommended building them and making them more expensive. How was the assumption made that a premium cost for downtown units could work?
- Leland's research indicated that rents had increased 10 percent in the past year in Wilsonville. In Tigard and other suburban places, rents increased 20 percent as mixed-use products came online. In order to achieve those rents, Wilsonville would need to offer other services and amenities. Early developments in Town Center could be town homes and the services associated with them. Then, other products would start to come in. There were opportunities for the City and private developers to work together to foster a certain type of development through tax credits or other things in the implementation program. The first few buildings were always the hardest. In order to achieve the vision, Wilsonville would need more people living in Town Center.
- Certainly, some sort of catalyst would be necessary; perhaps, it could be the Main Street District or a segment of the Main Street district. One challenge Wilsonville had over Orenco was that Town Center was huge area. Expecting things to happen would be difficult because available areas might not be the areas suited for catalyst developments. The City needed to be very thoughtful about how this plan was staged, so that money would be put where it could be used immediately.
- In a couple of weeks, the Task Force would be discussing what goes first, and then how should the development or money be tied to it.
- The Economic Summit Panel would be held at Regal Cinemas in Town Center from 4:00 pm to 5:30 pm and would include five developers who had worked on development in the private and public sectors, and had experience with financial incentives, tenant improvement programs, and parking projects. The panel would discuss the proposed implementation strategies and how they related to feasibility; how developments could occur over time; economic development ideas; how the public could invest in infrastructure and the impact to development; as well as what type of economic development strategies the City might be interested in. Attendees would be able to weigh in on which strategies they believed were most important. The panel discussion would feed into the project team's discussion with the Task Force and the Planning Commission next month. She would try to get the event recorded.

Additional comments regarding the Town Center Plan were as follows:

- The Commission had discussed restricting retail spaces to 30,000 sq ft last time, so the language on Page 115 about permitting retail spaces exceeding 30,000 sq ft might need revised to make sure the restrictions were stated correctly. The intent was to get away from big box stores.
- Doing a project like this would be difficult without an anchor tenant nearby, so an anchor was necessary.
- Goodwill and Rite Aid were 30,000 sq ft. The project team could ask the economic summit panel what the right size was for Town Center, which was a bit more commercially focused.
- The language did not reflect the conclusion from the previous discussion that the restriction would not apply to an anchor tenant in a standalone, mixed-use building.
- The goal was to encourage walkability, not driving from store to store within Town Center. How big would a larger building with multiple retail facilities be?

Scott Mansur, DKS Associates presented via PowerPoint the Traffic Impact Analysis, which was included in the packet.

He addressed questions from the Commission, and the Commission provided additional comments as follows:

- The traffic analysis did not assume any I-5 improvements at the Boone Bridge because there were no funded improvements; however, many agencies and ODOT were looking into improvements.
- When ODOT came before the Commission, there was a discussion about if nothing was done, there would be significant backlogs on Wilsonville Rd, 20 years from now; however, the traffic analysis did not correlate with that.
- I-5 was ODOT's facility and the traffic analysis considered what would be the City's responsibility for the intersections as development occurred. What could happen to I-5 was an unknown. Mr. Mansur agreed if ODOT did nothing and traffic volumes continued to increase on I-5, Wilsonville would have backups and continued congestion on Wilsonville Rd during the peak periods.
- The traffic analysis essentially ignored that I-5 existed and just showed the potential capacity for the interchanges that existed. While the analysis was based on actual traffic, it was not an everyday occurrence, like an accident. As traffic volumes increased on I-5, the merge and weaving would increase, which would add congestion. Wilsonville had done its part to add capacity at the I-5/Wilsonville Rd interchange.
- The alignment for Town Center Lp W would be discussed again at the next Task Force meeting.
- The alignment that came from the community discussion that would potentially move Town Center Lp W to the east and vacate part of the street on the west side received mixed reviews from the public. It was one of the less favorable concepts on the table, but it was not an overwhelming no. One question that was raised was whether it would really be worth the investment. The Task Force was continuing that conversation and would be discussing the pros and cons. There was a potential to include it as an alternative because vacating that portion of Town Center Lp W and relying solely on an eastern alignment would have to be the last improvement because it would rely on the Main Street and Courtside extensions, as well as having many other improvements, including the eastern alignment in place, to allow for vacating the western alignment. Once all those investments were made, there could be a discussion about vacating the western portion and allowing for additional development potential on the I-5 frontage. Following that discussion, the issue would be brought back to the Planning Commission.
- Having it as an alternative would depend on the plan that the Commission and City Council approved. Developers could not move a road, so the option needed to be in the plan if that was what the Task Force determined.
- The projected route went through Fry's parking lot. The equation would change quite a bit if the parking lot owner wanted to do it.
- The traffic study showed the connection on Town Center Lp W was still important regardless of its location. There might be a reason to move it in the long-term, but the connection would be essential to traffic function on Wilsonville Rd.
- Removing the connection that would distribute traffic on Main Street would alter the system a bit more.

- There would be a lot of projects and the City needed to decide where money should be spent. Perhaps, the scale of Town Center Lp W could be reduced to two lanes; some of it could be used for storm water or developed into a linear park. The Task Force should discuss aligning Town Center Lp W for the best use of the frontage on I-5. The bigger issue was where to invest the money and what the connection should look like in the future.

Chair Greenfield called for a brief recess and reconvened the meeting at 7:56 pm.

#### B. Citywide Signage & Wayfinding Plan (Neamtzu)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, introduced Mary Stewart, Landscape Architect with Alta Planning + Design, and said she and her design team were the primary authors of the Draft citywide Signage and Wayfinding Plan provided to the Planning Commission. He noted the large mock-up displayed at the back of the room represented one of the preferred signage designs. He described how feedback obtained from community members and the work with the design consultants led to the creation of the three distinct sign families presented in the Signage and Wayfinding Plan.

- Fifty-five percent of the survey responses from the physical and online open houses preferred the undulating stone sign theme. This theme could already be seen in the community in Old Town, and at Murase Plaza and the Water Treatment Plant.
- Input and feedback were provided by an internal team of stakeholders on a number of alternatives to the design elements of the undulating stone theme, which led to the sign family presented today which had slightly evolved from the original open house design, but was still within its intent. He sought the Commission's input on the preferred sign family, its implementation and distribution, and any other feedback they wished to provide.
- A work session would be held with City Council on November 5<sup>th</sup>, and if no other work sessions were needed and there was consensus regarding the Signage & Wayfinding Plan, Staff would proceed with the adoption process.

Mary Stewart presented the Draft Citywide Signage and Wayfinding Plan via PowerPoint, highlighting the process timeline, the Project Goals used as guiding principles for the project, and the research and testing that had determined the preferred design theme. The project was a couple months behind schedule due to going back and forth on the refinements, but the project team still hoped to begin implementing the Signage Plan in the spring, depending upon the timing of City Council's approval. She reviewed the various design iterations considered and adjusted during the process, noting the community showed a strong sentiment to represent Wilsonville's connection to the Willamette River and retain the city's historic character. She noted Commission feedback was also needed on the proposed destination abbreviations (Slide 26), adding that "Tech Corners" was the name her team had given the group of tech industries.

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

- The name "Tech Corners" might be confusing, but businesses move and business names change so names should not be used. Several different ideas were mentioned, including Silicon Field, Silicon Acres, Silicon Orchard, Tech Glen, and Tech Grove.
- The word "corner" seemed rather local and narrow. The tech industry in Wilsonville was growing and would outgrow the corner.
- Water Treatment Park or Water Treatment Plant should be used, not both park and plant.
- The schools were misnamed: Inza School should be Wood School, and Meridian School should be Meridian Creek. Regarding Wilsonville High, Inza School, and Lowery Primary, naming the type of school, High, Middle, or Primary, should be consistent for all schools.

- Ms. Stewart clarified the focus group included all kinds of different members of the community, but the wayfinding destinations list was based on previous wayfinding work that focused on pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Drivers in an unfamiliar city would look for Destination Level 1 signs. In Wilsonville, Town Center would be a misnomer because one would expect to find the Post Office and City Hall. The Post Office, City Hall, and Library were much lower as Destination Level 3 signs. City Hall should be at Level 1 to orient visitors to Wilsonville's civic center, especially in an emergency.
- The City logo looked odd and out-of-scale as a sign topper (far right of Slide 18), but it looked fine incorporated into the Gateway Sign. Removing the word "Oregon" from the sign topper on the left was also discussed.
  - Ms. Stewart explained the alternative topper (Slide 18) was added in response to comments about the topper to the left being too large and wanting to see something different. A fair amount of debate had taken place about including the word "Oregon" on the sign, and it was determined that the design should mimic the City's logo and include "Wilsonville, Oregon".
  - Mr. Neamtzu noted his business card from the City before the rebranding stated "City of Wilsonville in Oregon." It was a legacy of the past he was happy to let go.
- Bluetooth tracking was not used to determine key routes for prioritizing the location of wayfinding signs. Apps such as Google Maps and Waze could indicate routes and traffic, but apps did not document the locations people were traveling to or from. The data crunching Ms. Stewart's team had done was vetted by Mr. Neamtzu and the stakeholders from various City departments. Valuable feedback was received, such as that Villebois was a more frequent destination than the data indicated.
  - Portland State was engaged in activity to track bicyclists, but Ms. Stewart was not aware of the database that stored Bluetooth tracking of motorists entering and traveling in the city. She noted that sometimes motorists were following a route that Google recommended and, if they missed a stop, they might be traveling in circles which would provide misleading data. She acknowledged her team's data was not 100 percent accurate, but it was a starting point to help them hone in on what should be a priority. Stakeholders would review the data for discrepancies, and knowledge about traffic issues was also layered in.
- Villebois was a big residential area and people often got lost finding it or trying to leave it. Villebois was not included on the map in the report partially because it had its own wayfinding. Ms. Stewart's team did not evaluate it for this project, but were told getting people to and through Villebois would help solve the problems, and Barber St was identified as a primary route for that. The other roads were already signed for Villebois.
- The existing welcome sign at the existing edge of the northern most neighborhood would need to be moved farther north to represent the future northern boundary of the Frog Pond West neighborhood. (Slide 28) Applications were already being received for projects going north along Stafford Rd extending the northern city boundary to Frog Pond Ln.
  - Having gateways into the community was discussed during the Frog Pond project. Because the Frog Pond development "Welcome to Wilsonville" signs would be needed to the east and north as well.
  - There would be an odd, large space on the corner where the big, existing welcome sign was located for which the City probably already had right-of-way. Comments for using the space included putting in a coffee shop, giving more yard to the adjacent property owners, and a nature park.

The Commissioners noted their signage design preferences as listed with additional comments as noted:

- Signage Design Options:
  - The Commission consented that its preferred design option was the undulating stone with ledgestone veneer base.
    - Mr. Neamtzu noted the base was similar to the Murase Plaza sign, but with smaller stacked rock. The colors were similar and the materials could be found around the community, so it was a logical connection.

- Ms. Stewart added the feedback received was that brick existed everywhere in Wilsonville, so no brick was wanted in the signage. Signs were wanted that would coordinate well with a brick building behind them.
- Strike “Oregon” from the sign topper (Slide 18)
  - The small Wilsonville logo on the alternate topper was not ideal. If the size of the sign topper was a concern, the width of the sign topper could be narrowed.
  - The curved sign topper needed to be smaller as it was too dominating.
- Large Park, City Building, and Gateways Signs (Slide 19):
  - The consensus was to keep “Boones Ferry” above the word “Park”.
    - Commissioner Mesbah disagreed, adding the words should be on one line to replicate the natural flow of English print.
  - The City’s logo should remain on the Welcome to Wilsonville sign and not on the stone base.
    - Doing so would be more affordable to build because it would eliminate the need for an additional metal piece needed to support it.
- Vehicular Signs (Slide 20):
  - The alternate design with a bit of a curve or return on top of the sign was the Commission’s preferred option.
- Wayfinding Destinations (Slide 26):
  - Abbreviations:
    - Meridian Creek, Wood Middle (not Inza), Boones Ferry, and Boeckman Creek were the correct school names.
      - Use P.S. for primary school, M.S. for middle school, and H.S. for high school. Adding periods would make the abbreviations more understandable.
    - All of the schools should be called out separately, not just some of them.
      - Mr. Neamtzu explained Art Tech was under a lease agreement so he was hesitant to add it to a sign as the school would likely have a permanent, long-term home in the future.
    - The Villebois Piazza was not a park.
    - Community should be spelled out rather than “Comm Center”.
  - The SMART Station should be at least a Destination Level 2, if not Level 1, especially if the City wanted it to be more frequently used.
    - Drivers need to be able to find the train or bus to pick people up, and in the future, people would be coming across the bridge on bicycles to catch the train back into the city.
    - The SMART station should be a higher destination level than Tech Corners.
    - Following discussion, the Commission agreed to simply use “Transit Center” for the abbreviation which was common in other communities.
  - Having Tech Corners as a Level 1 destination was questioned.
    - No other major business areas, besides retail, were being called out. Basalt Creek was called out, but it was a district.
    - “Tech Corners” was not a name any one in Wilsonville was used to or would recognize. If a sign brought up more questions than it answered, it was a bad sign.
    - The name was too local and did not fairly represent Wilsonville’s tech industry that was located elsewhere.
    - The City did not have good names for the business districts, including the 95<sup>th</sup> Ave corridor, and more districts, like Parkway Woods, would be added. The City should consider the branding of the different business districts.
      - Ms. Stewart suggested a citywide survey to ask people for names.
    - Following discussion, the Commission agreed to strike “Tech Corners” completely.
- Wayfinding Routes (Slide 28):

- The Boeckman/Canyon Creek Rd intersection was the only place with all four directional signs for vehicular traffic, and not many areas had even two directional signs.
  - Ms. Stewart replied the feedback received was that when I-5 backed up, that intersection became a primary auxiliary route to get around the backup and Boeckman Rd became very important at that point as well.
  - There was less concern about directing people traveling straight through Wilsonville than assisting those who lived in the city.
  - Having the four directional signs at the intersection was good, because it was very walked and biked.
  - Wilsonville Meadows was located by the high school and the Boeckman Primary and the area was heavily walked and biked as well. It was odd that no signage was proposed at the two intersections on Boeckman Rd up to the high school and Boeckman Creek Primary School.
    - Villebois had wayfinding signage, but Meadows, which was a big neighborhood, did not. Pedestrian signs should be added in the Meadows neighborhood or at least on its exterior along Wilsonville Rd.
    - Ms. Stewart noted that all of the wayfinding signage for bicycling had already been installed per the previous plan. The toppers were intended to tie the brand in to those existing signs, but they were not part of the phase strategy, but would be added as funds allowed. Toppers were a low-cost item to add.
- Additional Considerations:
  - Signage should be added to trailheads, including the Boeckman Creek Trail and the trail in Frog Pond.
  - It would be good to have signage to indicate that people could cross from the Meadows neighborhood over to the Courtside neighborhood. Currently, there was no sign on Wilsonville Rd directing people to that crossing.
  - Mr. Neamtzu confirmed he had noticed a similar sign design on a prominent corner in Clackamas, but it was not a citywide theme.
  - The “Tech Corners” concept should be regarded as an emergent idea as far as identifying employment districts. If three separate districts emerged, for example, then wayfinding signs could be added.
    - OIT was an important landmark and tech businesses could identify themselves as being in the OIT neighborhood.

Mr. Neamtzu invited comment from those in the audience.

Angela Niggli, Wilsonville citizen, agreed the sign topper should be a bit smaller and suggested striking the words “Welcome to” on the topper. She did not believe the logo was necessary on the Gateway Sign. (Slide 19) She did not like it there, but agreed it should be on the sign rather than on the stone; perhaps the logo could be a little smaller.

Ms. Stewart responded that “Welcome to” had been debated and was well liked.

Additional comments were as follows:

- The Commission agreed to retain “Welcome to” in the topper. Shortening the topper both horizontally and vertically was suggested.
  - Ms. Stewart said she did not know how much the topper could be shortened because the arch created the free space that the “Welcome to” text filled up.
- The logo on the Gateway Sign very clearly tied in with the City’s letterhead and other branding, but the placement was awkward.
  - Attaching the logo to the stone base might invite vandalism.

- The inclusion of “Oregon” on the Gateway Sign shown on Slide 14 created a better space for the smaller City logo to be added.

#### **IV. INFORMATIONAL**

##### **A. City Council Action Minutes (Sept. 6, 2018 and Sept. 17, 2018)**

Chair Greenfield said he appreciated having the action minutes and found them very helpful.

##### **B. 2018 Planning Commission Work Program**

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Manager, noted the public hearing for the Town Center Plan was tentatively scheduled for January. She agreed another work session might be necessary and would probably be held in January. She hoped to have the draft plan in November but, in discussions with the consultant and based on the prioritization that was necessary, she did not believe November was possible. Revised versions of what was being worked on with the Commission and final versions on those items where full dialog had occurred would be presented. Final versions would mostly be the technical appendices and attachments, or individual chapters. She estimated the full plan with all of the revisions discussed in November and January would be discussed during a work session, and then a hearing would be held.

- She believed the French Prairie Bridge Open House would be posted this week or next. Commissioner Springall noted three or possibly five design alternatives would be presented at the Open House with the idea that it would be refined to a smaller number to take to City Council. He encouraged the Commission to attend the Open House. Ms. Bateschell said the digital open house would be posted tomorrow.

Chair Greenfield encouraged the Commissioners to attend the event at the theatre tomorrow for the Economic Development Summit focusing on the Town Center Plan.

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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