

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2018  
6:00 P.M.**

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

Minutes approved as  
presented at the  
Dec. 12, 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, Kamran Mesbah, and Ron Heberlein.

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

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

A. Consideration of the October 10, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes  
The October 10, 2018 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented

**II. LEGISLATIVE HEARING**

A. Boones Ferry Park Master Plan (McCarty)  
(Public Hearing continued from October 10, 2018)

Chair Greenfield read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:10 pm.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, noted the public hearing on the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan was originally opened before the Planning Commission on August 8, 2018. The Commission then continued the Master Plan to October 10 and then to November 14, 2018. Given the fact that citizens were in attendance to participate tonight, he was confident the City successfully communicated the delays related to the Master Plan. He was pleased to introduce the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan.

Mike McCarty, Parks and Recreation Director, acknowledged the delays noting a really good plan had been developed with the consultant. He noted Chair Greenfield had attended a couple of the public meetings, which he appreciated, as he could see firsthand the effort being made. Wilsonville had a quarter of a mile of riverfront, which was unique, but one could not really see the river much. Most of the public comment regarded being able to see and access the river, not necessarily for swimming, but perhaps kayaking, so people would know the river was there. A geologist, hydrologist, and others visited the site, and determined some things initially proposed could not be done at this time and were removed from the map, so the proposed Master Plan was more realistic. He encouraged questions and suggestions from the Commission, noting that if

approved, the Plan would not go before City Council until December 17, 2018, thereby allowing time to make any changes.

Brian Stevenson, Parks and Recreation Program Manager, presented the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan via PowerPoint with the following comments:

- **Background and Context.** Boones Ferry Park was a 15-acre parcel located at the end of Boones Ferry Rd that included the existing park, parcels to the east and west, and a small, wooded section that extended to north. (Slides 3 and 4)
- **Public Outreach.** The project team was proud of the amount of public outreach done to ensure the neighborhood was aware of what was happening, but also so the general community could provide feedback as well. (Slide 4) It was important to ensure the amenities in the park met the needs of the community, but also played true to the historic nature of the park and what those in that neighborhood wanted the park to become. In trying to create something that was important to the community as a whole, the team did its best to be sensitive to the neighborhood surrounding the park.
  - When asking citizens what they wanted to see in the park, the main request was natural river access and to keep natural areas, natural. The neighbors and those involved in the process wanted to minimize the development of wooded areas and provide for more activities, such as basketball, fishing, trails along the river, and bike access.
    - The project team was excited because the items that the majority of citizens wanted were integrated into the Master Plan, as well as those items requested by a minority of citizens, so the team believed the Plan met the needs and desires of those involved in the master planning process.
  - Based on the public input provided, three conceptual plans were developed, varying from super-activated plans packed full of amenities to some that integrated the river a little more. The community provided input on the three plans, which resulted in the refined plan currently being presented.
- **Master Plan Highlights.** The proposed Draft Master Plan was not a lot different from the Plan previously presented to the Commission. He indicated the location of various features and park amenities with these key comments (Slide 7):
  - The river dock would provide access for non-motorized watercrafts, including canoes, kayaks, paddleboards, etc. Rental opportunities would also be integrated into the park for these items.
  - Connecting with the river was important; not just being in the river, but seeing it. Therefore, a number of river overlooks were proposed.
  - Having trails and preserving the wooded areas were comments heard regularly. The north wooded area of the park would remain wooded with only a paved, looped, walking trail circling through it, but no further development.
  - The dog park was the biggest, newest element in the park. The dirt, bike skills course would allow for some off-road riding opportunities.
  - The Master Plan also called for an update to the Tauchman House, which aligned with the Facilities Master Plan, updating the upstairs into a bridal or event venue. The Master Plan added an outdoor, plaza space, which would further the ability to host outdoor events.
    - The basketball court would be tucked in closer to the Tauchman House for a couple reasons. If the Tauchman House was rented, that area could be included as part of the rental and double the event space, thereby expanding the rental venue.
  - The natural playground would weave in and out of the trees and include a mix of some traditional elements, as well as a treehouse-like structure to provide a river overlook. (Slide 8)
  - With regard to connections to existing and planned trails, construction would begin on the connection from Boones Ferry Park to the Memorial Park Trail within the next year. Future connections would also be provided to the French Prairie Bridge, as well as north to the Ice Age Tonquin Trail.
  - Additional parking had been added in several areas, including at the dog park and bicycle area.

- The biggest change from the previous draft Master Plan was relocating two previous on-street parking areas and making them off-street parking with a small separation similar to that seen at Town Center Park.
  - The other major component that was eliminated was the second dock and ADA accessible trail to the river. Some preliminary outreach with several consultants showed it was not possible; however, an area near the existing ferry landing would be sufficient for an ADA access.
    - The ADA accessible trail was replaced with a soft-surface, seasonal trail that would likely flood in the winter time, but would still provide a looped access in the summer, as well as river access.
    - He clarified the walkway would not be as shown in Slide 8; in reality, more plantings might go up the hill a bit to create the same feel, but the walkway would not be on a steep cliff.
- The Boones Ferry Park project was divided into five phases. Phase 1 would include the elements tied to the river, which was the community's top addition to the park. Due to the number of unknowns, the \$10 million cost was a ballpark figure. The staff report indicated it would be more in the \$8 to \$10 million range. Slide 9 indicated what the phasing could look like; however, certain elements might need to be adjusted into other phases in order to be more efficient and find some cost savings.
- Next Steps. More technical studies were necessary, including a land survey and more hydrology work to ensure the placement of the dock would be sufficient. Dock building companies confirmed the dock could be built, the question was how much would it cost to build the dock in that location.
  - After doing more homework and making any necessary refinements, Phase 1 development would begin. Upon completion of Phase 1, Phase 2 would be reviewed and implemented.
  - The Boones Ferry Master Plan provided the bigger picture and the elements that would go into the park, but some of the more technical elements needed to be determined.
- He concluded by noting the pictures on Slide 11 featured elements being considered for Boones Ferry Park.

Chair Greenfield asked if there was a tentative time schedule for the phases, and if cost of living was reflected in the cost projection.

- Mr. McCarty replied that with the comprehensive Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Town Center Master Plan, Memorial Park Master Plan, as well as the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan, the next job might be to determine what the top priority was, so the time frame would be hard to pinpoint. With the parks projects throughout the city estimated at \$25 to \$30 million, it was difficult to say what the next step would be. As stated, the trail in Boones Ferry was scheduled for next year, but pinpointing even the next three years would be difficult. The next step would be to prioritize.
- Mr. Stevenson said he did not believe the cost of living was reflected, adding those numbers were the cost if it was build today. As any capital projects got pushed out, the figures would be adjusted accordingly.
- Mr. McCarty added the estimates in all of the parks master plans would need an escalator for the next ten or fifteen years, like five percent, three percent, two percent, etc. to determine those costs. That was another thing that needed done.

Commissioner Postma:

- Inquired about the cost estimates. Phase 1 included building a dock, some clearing, and work by the river. Phase 2 was a completely undeveloped area. Phase 3 was an area that already had some features, yet it was almost twice as expensive as the other phases. He asked what was driving the cost on Phase 3 to make it significantly more expensive than the others. He thought a completely undeveloped area along the river would be more expensive.
  - Mr. Stevenson explained the renovations to the Tauchman House were largely why Phase 3 was significantly higher than the others. Removing the Tauchman House figures would make Phase 3 more in line with some of the other cost perspectives. He confirmed the Tauchman House renovations would cost approximately \$1 million.

- Noted access to the river was a big part of the Master Plan, and he was curious if that was being met with this Plan. For instance, there was a pathway up towards the top, but it was offset from the ridge where he expected it. Was it possible to get those walkways closer to that edge and to provide some sitting areas there? If the hydrology prevented some of the elements desired along the water's edge, could other elements be pushed a bit more toward that drop off or visibility range?
  - Mr. Stevenson confirmed the walkway was designed to be pushed as close to the bank as possible, and that the tree clearing in Phase 1 would provide even more visibility.

Commissioner Milan:

- Noted a letter in the packet discussed the Historical Society being very interested in the Tauchman House. She asked how that would mesh with the renovation plans for it being a rental venue.
  - Mr. Stevenson replied that meshing might not be possible. Staff decided to hold true to the Facilities Master Plan, which called for renovating the house into an event space, which also fit its current use through the Parks Department as a wedding, birthday, or memorial event venue. After analyzing different options for its use, such as space for water sport rentals or for the Historical Society or similar non-profits groups, Staff determined the best use would be to keep the Tauchman House as an event venue, providing continued revenue for the City and making it a place where the community and visitors would want to host events.
- Said she was glad to see the parking moved off-street, as it would have been an inconvenience to the neighborhood.
- Asked if the dog park and bicycle park being close together would create any conflict.
  - Mr. McCarty replied the dog park would be fenced, which would provide a buffer, and dogs should be on leashes.
  - Mr. Stevenson noted there was a topography difference between the dog park and bicycle park.
- Asked if any buffer of trees would be removed in that area. During her visit, the noise level from the freeway was quite intense, even with all the existing trees, leaves, etc.
  - Mr. Stevenson replied no, Staff would do their best to integrate the existing trees in the area, except those found to be unhealthy or that might present a danger.
- Recalled discussion about providing security at Memorial Park as well as for that neighborhood, and asked if any thought had been given on how to ensure the park would be a safe location for people at night, or conversely, during the daytime.
  - Mr. Stevenson replied a similar pattern would be used, working with the local police department on increasing patrols. Gating the park had been discussed. However, after considering where the gates could be located and how that might impact the neighborhood and access to public streets, only two parking lots would be minimized and pedestrians could still access the park. Based on that, the decision was to not have gates into the two parking areas.
  - Mr. McCarty confirmed Staff had met with the police chief about increased patrols after the recent Memorial Park incident, and he made a pledge to do so. During fair weather months, bicycle police patrols would be used more often in the various parks. He confirmed Staff considered different gate locations, but the gates did not work.

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Asked about the thought process for bringing the basketball court closer to the plaza.
  - Mr. Stevenson explained the thought process was two-fold. First, with the outdoor event plaza, four events would be outside and people would be utilizing that space more and more. There would still be noise from the basketball court regardless of where it was located in the park. Secondly, shifting the court closer to the event venue, it could be wrapped into the event rental itself, allowing it to be utilized as an extended space, and essentially, taking it out of use for the general public for those few events that would rent that outside space.
- Understood the basketball area would be part of the rental at all times.

- Mr. Stevenson responded Staff had not fully decided whether renting the basketball court would be optional or if an additional rental fee would be required. Because the court was an amenity, Staff wanted to avoid monopolizing it for renters that would not use the outside space. Staff wanted community members to utilize the basketball court as much as possible, but there could be events where the court could be added onto a rental with an additional fee. The permitting process had not been determined.
- Mr. McCarty added the decision about whether to move the basketball court was a major consternation, which also tied into leaving Phase 3 as an open green space for various activities, like playing catch or Frisbee. Such spaces were popular because there were not many of them.
- Asked about the square footage for the Tauchman House, noting estimates for the restoration seemed high. He asked what was driving that estimate, and what other options might exist.
  - Mr. Stevenson said the estimate was pulled from the Facilities Plan completed by the City's Public Works Department in 2015 and adjusted to reflect today's values. No additional research had been done on the renovations to the house in the subject Master Plan.

Commissioner Springall:

- Recalled that currently, the top floor of the Tauchman House could not be used due to safety concern, so structural renovations would be necessary, which was reflected in the cost.
  - Mr. Stevenson agreed, adding egress to the upstairs was also needed as no appropriate egress currently existed.
- Noted of the three wooded areas under discussion, the northern area would remain untouched. He confirmed the eastern wooded area would also remain untouched, in order to provide shielding.
- Noted testimony about the eastern orchard area that was not currently in use, other than for the neighborhood. He asked if the parking lot would impact the trees or if the area more open.
  - Mr. Stevenson replied the parking area and what was proposed would have minimal impact on the trees in the area shown as Phase 5. (Slide 9). As part of the Master Plan, a point was made to just have the parking that comes from the road, as well as the one trail system, understanding that Boones Ferry Park had to be compatible and work together with the landing of the bridge. He confirmed the timeline for completion of the French Prairie Bridge was uncertain.
- Confirmed there was no particular plan for planting new trees or removing trees in the west side of the park, so the mature trees would be left in place. He noted the riverfront trees might have to be removed to provide visual access.
  - Mr. Stevenson explained the Plan included just vista pruning and thinning to increase the views, and working with the existing trees. Nothing in the Plan explicitly called for the removal of trees.
- Inquired if the old Boones Ferry Access Rd was shallow enough for ADA access or if it would have to be extended somehow.
  - Mr. Stevenson replied in its current state, it was not ADA compliant. Some switchbacks would need to be integrated approximately where "1" was shown on Slide 9, in order to meet ADA compliance. The existing historical roadway did not meet that.
- Confirmed the access would be only for pedestrians and not motor vehicles.

Commissioner Postma asked if there were any revenue projections for the Tauchman House, considering the added expense.

- Mr. Stevenson answered no, adding he would argue that the current rental revenue would not be comparable to revenue after the expansion and renovation.

Commissioner Heberlein asked if any other comparables existed in Wilsonville or in the vicinity.

- Mr. Stevenson replied yes, citing the McLean House in West Linn, which was an older home that had been renovated and was used for a number of events, including weddings. Staff could pull revenue figures for comparison.

Commissioner Millan commented that it would be difficult to haul a kayak down that hill. While there was ADA accessibility with switchbacks, that was not conducive to getting a kayak down the hill, especially if it was on a trailer.

- Mr. Stevenson noted conveyer belt-type systems existed with rollers where one could get a canoe or kayak down to the water without having to navigate carrying it or struggling with it on an switchbacks. The team did look at what options would be available to get watercraft down to the water without having to carry it or navigate switchbacks.
  - Commissioner Postma noted he had navigated that with a kayak, and it was not that bad.

Chair Greenfield called for public testimony regarding the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan.

Rose Case, 9150 SW 4<sup>th</sup> St, Old Town, stated the Park Plan was a very good one, and everyone were pretty happy with it, but she had a couple concerns. She noted the orchard area would be gone if a bridge were put in, especially if it was to handle emergency vehicles. She used to drive a school bus, which was comparable in size, and she did not see vehicles that size would be able turn within that space unless the orchard area was completely torn out. She was also concerned about lost truckers coming down Boones Ferry Rd to the park. She had seen them take out power lines, posts, tree branches, etc., so that was something that needed to be considered. Also, the school bus company should be consulted about getting larger buses into the apartment complex before that whole section was put in. She recalled that when Lowrie Primary was built, no one consulted the bus company about getting the buses in and out until it was already built.

- She could see the basketball court being a real issue, since it had always been free for everybody to use. She could understand having events at the Tauchman House, which was a great site, but she was concerned about the effect of the basketball court being rented and not available.
- She believed the proposal was a great use of the park, but reiterated her concern about emergency vehicles being able to use the bridge. Addressing the issue now would make planning easier. The bridge landing would take up the whole orchard area and could impact the parking lot, walkway, and possibly parking for the Tauchman House.

Chair Greenfield noted a number of communications from the community had already been included in the public record.

Monica Keenan, 9460 SW 4<sup>th</sup> St, Wilsonville, said she recommended fencing off the areas of Phase 4 that backed up to homes or into the immediate neighborhood. Those parts of the park and wooded trail would be isolated and not easily patrolled at night. It would be good to provide some sort of a buffer. Additionally, she noted that traffic and parking were big concerns for the neighborhood. The City had tried to make the parking less impactful to the neighboring homes, but she requested that signage or something be included to remind people they were driving through a neighborhood to get to a neighborhood park.

- In support of some of the written testimony and Rose Case's comments, the historic field and orchard where the bike bridge was proposed should be preserved to retain the green space.
- She was looking forward to the park cleaned up and being able to see the river was a huge bonus.

Chair Greenfield called for any additional questions or discussions from the Commission.

Commissioner Springall recalled discussion about signage during the 5<sup>th</sup> Street Extension about limiting traffic going south of 5<sup>th</sup> St into Old Town and asked if that would mitigate the concerns expressed about trucks and other traffic ending up at the end of Boones Ferry Rd. He believed it needed to be signed, probably at 5<sup>th</sup> St. There was already a sign for entering the neighborhood, and additional neighborhood-type signs would be useful throughout Old Town, but not at the park.

Chair Greenfield noted the need for signage was independent of the Master Plan, and the City could take another look at that issue.

Commissioner Springall agreed, noting the French Prairie Bridge was not a part of the Master Plan either.

Chair Greenfield believed such details would be addressed in the future. He confirmed the phases of park's development were subject to a Development Review Board level hearing, adding the requirements could be addressed at that time.

Commissioner Hurley agreed with signage. He confirmed that park hours in the City were 5:00 am to 10:00 pm, noting Ms. Keenan's concerns about the wooded area, and stated posting park hours made enforcement easier. He also suggested posting a sign at the basketball court to inform that the court could be rented, similar to those for the structures at Memorial Park.

Chair Greenfield closed the public hearing at 6:55.

Commissioner Postma moved to approve the Boones Ferry Park Master Plan and adopt Resolution No. LP18-0008. Commissioner Mesbah seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Greenfield called for a brief recess and reconvened the meeting at 7:04 pm.

### **III. WORK SESSION**

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

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Manager, introduced project team members, Alex Dupey from MIG, the consulting firm helping with the project, and Associate Planner Kim Rybold. The final project Task Force meeting was held last month to discuss the implementation for the Town Center Plan. The team had been working diligently with the Planning Commission over a number of work sessions and had provided an overview of the implementation plan to the Commission last month. Tonight, the team would go more in-depth about the regulatory changes, infrastructure projects, as well as some placemaking and economic development programs. Feedback from the Task Force would also be discussed, and the Commission's input was requested on what the City's priorities should be and its role in the Plan, as well as what catalysts would make the community's vision for Town Center a reality.

Alex Dupey, MIG Consulting stated that during the last Task Force meeting, each of the major elements were reviewed and prioritized in terms of what the potential framework projects might be. The Planning Commission input was needed on whether those framework projects should continue through developing the draft plan over the next six weeks, before returning to the Planning Commission in the New Year. The project team had also been working on the Development Code and had provided revised language for discussion based on comments the Planning Commission had during the last meeting.

Mr. Dupey presented via PowerPoint updates to the Town Center Plan regarding Draft Implementation Measures, which focused namely on infrastructure, as well as Draft Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments, and recommended Design Guidelines.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission regarding the Town Center Plan and responses to Commissioner questions was as follows:

- Ms. Bateschell agreed to email the detailed images of the intersections missing from the printed
- The bike/pedestrian project on Rebekah St (I-2.G, Slide 7) would be included with the Wilsonville Rd improvements, which would also incorporate a flashing pedestrian beacon and making Rebekah a right-in, right-out as opposed to the current signalized intersection. Rebekah St was part of the local street network, so if Safeway or Rite-Aid redeveloped over time, and the connection from Canyon Creek Rd to Rebekah St did occur, a variety of local road cross-sections in the Plan addressed bike/pedestrian connectivity, which could include bike lanes and shared lanes. However, the bike/pedestrian project was focused on Wilsonville Rd, and the costs involved with that element.

- Town Center Loop E would have cycle tracks, which were recommended throughout Town Center, essentially connecting the pedestrian bridge in the northwest corner to Memorial Park in the southeast quadrant. That project, shown as I-2.K, was a specific project within Town Center Loop E. The circle shown at the Town Center Loop E/Wilsonville Rd was just the intersection itself.
- How would this project impact the business community on Main St, specifically the streets leading into the intersections on the south side, and would those be affected?
  - The connections south of Wilsonville Rd would be maintained, and there might be some cut-through of the Main Street south of Wilsonville Rd, which could result in some circulation changes there. Most people leaving Town Center were expected to stay on Wilsonville Rd, but some additional vehicles could continue on Main Street. The benefit was that area had already been designed for that function. Based on the traffic analysis, no real impact was expected on the streets south of Wilsonville Rd.
- A “Town Center district association” could be organized in a variety of ways but were often non-profits, which was a typical downtown business association template. As a non-profit, a board would be established, and then a city would often provide seed-money to get it started. As businesses signed on, they would agree to tax or assess themselves whatever percentage they chose to fund projects or the organization. That could include hardscape items, like street sweeping and garbage pickup, or for programming, like festivals and events that generate interest in the area and also attract businesses.
  - The district could also be a subset of a Chamber of Commerce, and there was often a Chamber member on the board. The district would not replace the Chamber as an advocate; it was really more focused on that specific area. The Chamber had a large number of responsibilities, and often partnered with such districts to be certain that their interests being aligned.
- Were there any examples of such a district in the region?
  - Oregon City had a great Main Street Program that was responsible for a lot of the development there. Lloyd Purdy, who was on the Economic Development Forum, and Nancy Kraushaar, who was at the City of Oregon City at the time, were strong partners in streetscape improvements to attract specific businesses into downtown. Mr. Purdy learned what the business’s issues were and become an advocate for those businesses. Oregon City had become a very successful space. Milwaukee also had a burgeoning downtown district. It took time but even a little bit of advocacy helped to align businesses.
  - Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce representatives were on the Task Force, so the district concept had been before them throughout the project. Chamber members also attended at all the different focus groups with small business where the district idea had come up in terms of an identified need. Better organization was needed, as well as the ability to have more capacity, more programming to liven up the area, and some type of coordination. The implementation portion of the Plan was where different ways of doing those things would be discussed, such as with a Main Street program, business district, subset of the Chamber, etc. Such questions would not be answered through this Plan, which looked at the concepts and implementation actions. The action item here could identify five organizations, for example, to partner to determine what that looked like.
    - As a follow up to the Task Force meeting three weeks ago, Staff had also discussed the district concept with the Chamber to determine what that might look like, and what its role would be in order to provide more direction in the Plan, so that it was not so open-ended but help direct what that future study or conversation would look like. None of the implementation items would lay out all the specifics, except for infrastructure projects and Code work. However, information in the Town Center Plan would determine what needed to be assessed in implementing the placemaking and economic development strategies, which were concepts and ideas that came from the process that needed to be fleshed out more.
    - The Chamber was engaged and the City was working with them, and Staff expected that would be an ongoing discussion.
- To move forward with the Plan, there had to be some coordinated interest on the part of the existing Town Center business owners. Wilsonville had an effective business organization, which could have a role in that.

The City could not do it by simply laying out a concept of what it believed Town Center should look like in 20 years, but getting from here to there would require some movers to get it started.

- The key piece was having an advocate within the business community, and the movers were there. The City could act as the initial catalyst through its Economic Development Department, but it would not always have to lead it; there needed to be interest from the businesses to do that. There were some very engaged businesses in Town Center that, if given the opportunity, would do that. Again, the district concept was just one option.
- Discussion regarding frameworks projects was as follows:
  - The complete extension of Park Place from beginning to end would be a priority framework project; regardless of whether it started at the north or south end. It would not work without the middle. The Park Place area would be the catalyst to start bringing the project together.
    - Without the Park Place extension, the plan became too abstract. Park Place gave Town Center a place to move out from. This was a critical piece in which the City could take a fairly active role and easily be a driver.
  - The framework must start with what was available for the businesses that were going to build in and operate in the Town Center area. The concern was the footprint limitations, and limiting things like drive-throughs, which would mean there could never be a Dutch Bros in this area. So many of the restrictions were based upon expectations of what the City would like to build, but it might not be what businesses could build and still make it economically sustainable because their hands were tied.
    - The catalyst was making sure that a plan was in place that made it possible to build something in Town Center in an economically feasible way. Experts in the field have stated that removing the potential for anchor tenants with the Code and some existing limitations might be disastrous.
    - Determining what framework project would be a catalyst was a struggle when the Plan was at a point where businesses could not get interested in doing anything yet. The concern amongst the Chamber and business community was that the Town Center must be a sustainable project they would want to invest and build in, and it was not there yet.
    - The square footage for an anchor tenant was 50,000 sq ft, but that was not sustainable or realistic on two floors. Some anchor tenants could work in smaller spaces, like Trader Joe's. If the market was limited based upon a footprint size, the City was just waiting for a particular developer or business designated ahead of time to show up and invest; rather than opening it up to see what the business community could build.
    - The concern was that this element keeps being discussed, but it had continued to be missed.
    - Drive-throughs were not going away; they were lunch and destination opportunities and should not be legislated out of existence. The Town Center Plan was so limiting, and that was a concern. Therefore, the question about choosing the initial framework projects could be answered because the framework on what was possible to build was already a bit too limited.
      - There were currently two coffee shops in Town Center and one had a drive-through. The general idea was to provide a walkable, safe neighborhood. There was a general concern with vehicles and pedestrians and dealing with those conflicts. Not that there should never be drive-throughs; perhaps at the corner locations on the perimeter or close to Town Center Loop E. In general, the Main Street area should be considered as a walkable area and have the most restrictive codes, understanding that the rest of the area was fairly wide open.
      - One positive concept of the Town Center Plan was the invitation to tarry, the opposite extreme of driving through. There might be areas within Town Center where drive-through was antithetical to that concept. However, areas on the periphery might be more amenable to drive-throughs.
  - The Main Street was the first thing that should be prioritized. It made sense for the southern part to be prioritized where possible. (I-2.D, Slide 7). It was not clear what would need to be done with the existing businesses and parking lots.

- The improved buffered bike lane on the southern section of Town Center Loop E as it approached Wilsonville Rd was exciting to see, as the current bike lane disappears at the bottom. The improvement would fix that and provide a more complete bike connection.
- Until the pedestrian bridge crossing I-5 was built, there was no point to prioritize that part of the bike lane.
- Park Place functioned as a main street for the Town Center area and received the main street district nomenclature mostly because the community kept coming back to the idea of a main street, where one could walk down the street; a destination with shops and restaurants. People did not want to create a historic main street, because Wilsonville did not have that history, but they were interested in a modern main street that was that kind of place. There was an actual Main St in town already, so this would be an extension of Park, and probably called Park Place, but it would serve as the main street for the town center area.
  - Calling it Park Place would probably be appealing to business developers.
- Was any of the Town Center planning likely to be a disincentive to businesses being interested in Town Center?
  - The Commission or City needed to determine what type of businesses it wanted to attract within Town Center. For example, increasing the street grid and providing these other connections would be a different land use form than Argyle Square, which was large format retail with large parking lots. The project team had been talking with the community to determine what exactly was Town Center, and the response was the hub or the heart of the City. Not Argyle Square, but a smaller scale, compact development pattern, possibly street-level businesses with residential above or other commercial spaces, but no big-box stores, and nothing with large parking areas.
    - Traditionally large format retailers were going into 25,000 to 50,000 sq ft sites. The selection was not as large, but the online portion of their selection was the same as the big box areas. Retail was transitioning to smaller floorplates. There would be a disincentive for a new business like Fry's to be built; however, for a mixed-use development that wanted to put in things like small-scale restaurants, being in Town Center would be an incentive.
    - The Town Center Plan could create incentives and new opportunities for existing property owners to do development that did not exist under the current Development Code and Town Center Plan.
  - Although some anchor stores were moving to smaller formats, it was still necessary to create a destination type of feel to attract people. The idea that a destination came from only small business was concerning, which was why 50,000 sq ft sounded like about the right size for an anchor store. Many retailers have an online presence and could have a smaller physical location, creating a destination where customers would pick up orders, have lunch, and shop at other nearby stores. Other small businesses would be attracted if they could see the potential for foot traffic because other destination points were available.
  - Town Center was next to I-5 and a major I-5 interchange. The concept that Town Center could stand on its own and be economically viable as just a walkable, tight-knit neighborhood, did not take into consideration that millions of people were traveling on I-5, which was a huge piece of the economics. Wilsonville did not have the density to keep stores alive.
  - The City of Portland prohibited big box stores at Cascade Station near the airport, and the land sat vacant for more than a decade. The retail landscape was changing dramatically, but people still want to a hands-on shopping experience.
  - The City must be careful about what was prescribed to the economics of Town Center, especially considering this could be a 30 to 40 year plan, so the plan should be elastic. For example, in the next 10 years, people would be asking for Uber or Lyft stops rather than bus stops.
  - Having some or at least guiding the infrastructure in Town Center in a template for the desired vision and feel for Town Center was just the window dressing on the economics of it working. People working in flex spaces would be coming in on I-5 from Woodburn, which was recently dubbed the suburb of Wilsonville. People would still be driving to Wilsonville. Maintaining flexibility was important because things were so dynamic right now.

- The draft Code currently required a two-story minimum throughout the district with a 30,000 sq ft maximum per floor. Should the City consider allowing two stories of commercial with 30,000 or 50,000 sq ft per floor?
  - The thinking was to have multi-story mixed use, as in retail on the first floor and either office or residential on the upper floors. Ikea was an approximately 200,000 sq-ft, two-story building with retail and warehousing, so it might be possible to imagine two-story retail. The Commission probably had no business restricting that in the Commercial Mixed-Use (C-MU) District. (Slide 25)
  - The idea behind a minimum of two-stories was to ensure that higher density and higher activity was built into this area. Having two stories of commercial was fine and met the interest in seeing increased level of activity per acre of land developed.
    - Town Center had good exposure on I-5, so higher than two-stories would be expected. Having 30,000 to 50,000 sq ft of commercial on the first floor, and just offices on the second floor would be a strange use, unless it was all part of the same business. Bridgeport Village had two-story furniture and book stores.
    - Buildings in the area of Albertsons was 60,000 sq ft, not including Starbucks, and Trader Joe's in the Hollywood District was approximately 25,000 to 30,000 sq ft.
- Was street frontage more important than the general size of the building? The concern was about having a gigantic box on the street, so perhaps it was about geometry. Having other small businesses on the street frontage with a decent-sized entrance for a larger retailer tucked behind served the purpose of providing the necessary footprint for a larger retailer that could be an anchor tenant, yet still accomplished the City's goals of having that feeling of density and smaller places.
  - The concept of retail on one floor with a lobby area on the side for offices on upper floors could be considered; though the financial metrics would require a taller building.
  - The concern was more the streetscape environment as opposed to the scale of the building. If there was a larger floorplate, potentially some requirement for frontage should be considered. This would help create a sense of place, and not having a Home Depot sitting on the main street; yet there would still be the ability to generate anchor store traffic.
- One struggle with larger, commercial stores was that they created car-dependent destinations, not lingering traffic. The Town Center area was large enough to have anchor stores on the edges, close to the main arteries to get in and out. The idea that anchor stores were required to add to the core of this redevelopment area was not convincing. This might be just a transitional kind of development, and the kinds of anchors that occur help develop the kind of residential and mixed use necessary in order to have residents who walking around to different businesses. Then, development would occur more organically from that more cohesive, substantive kind of community center. Nothing should inhibit that phased or organic type of development. The concern was that with too much flexibility; if anything goes, then anything goes and Town Center would become just anything. Town Center would not be able to compete with Bridgeport. Downtown Lake Oswego did not have those kinds of large anchors, and was doing fine, and it was not competing with Bridgeport. Wilsonville needed to find its place, making sure it fit and was culturally relevant and sustainable.
  - The Lake Oswego area around the Salt and Straw was a compact area. Town Center was significantly larger. The drive to maintain a smaller footprint would make more sense if this were not such a huge area. How could that flexibility be included to make sure development would be successful, while still meeting the goals of having that active Park Place area?
- On the edges of downtown Lake Oswego, within walking distance, were car dependent business with easy access and egress. The Commission needed to create a similar dynamic and balance, where as one got closer to the Town Center core, it became smaller and more granular with more flexibility on the edges for the 365s.
  - From a Code standpoint, that was how this was being established. The floorplate maximum was being discussed primarily for this area because of the highway visibility and existing development pattern. If the Commission were to allow a bit more flexibility for that development type, it would not necessarily have to be on Main Street.

- The challenge was that the project was so massive; it was difficult to envision what it would look like. But designating the core area, and then having concentric rings out from that where different development types, like drive throughs and large retail, were permissible would not close off options. A finite area would be restrictive so that it could be something different; something special with the park and other little parks and things.
  - Perhaps the Code could designate that within a certain radius of Park Place, as the center street, certain standards or criteria applied, and then the Code could be more expansive moving away from that core as far as what was allowed, which made sense, even from a business standpoint.
  - The Main Street District (MSD) was already clearly identified in Attachment B.
- Page 2 of Attachment B discussed the prohibited and permitted usages with regard to C-MU, Main Street, and drive-throughs. However, the wording was not clear about whether these were permitted or prohibited.
  - 30,000 sq ft was currently the maximum floorplate everywhere within Town Center, but from the feedback, perhaps Commercial-Mixed Use (C-MU) should be increased a bit and the standard a bit more stringent in areas like the Main Street.
    - Having larger, two-story retailers in the mixed-use area should be permissible.
  - Ms. Bateschell agreed there was a disconnect between (.02)E on Page 1 and (.03)A.1 on Page 2 of Attachment B. The thinking was that it would be allowable anywhere as long as the footprint was not greater than 30,000 sq ft, which was part of tonight's discussion. 30,000 sq ft was chosen to maintain the community's vision of a walkable, friendly, less auto dependent uses on the center Main Street.
    - She agreed the wording needed to be clearer, but the maximum square footage per use needed to be determined.
      - Was an overall maximum important, or was it really about the footprint? If it was the footprint, the 30,000 sq ft maximum was clear on the Main Street in the MSD.
      - And then, should a larger footprint be allowed in other areas, and if so, which areas? The concern from the Task Force and the Commission was more about the footprint rather than the overall maximum footprint. If Target wanted a two- or three-story building, the concern would be about the footprint and what it created in terms of the public realm and the walkability.
    - While a 90,000 sq ft, three-story Target would create a parking dilemma, Target would have to provide parking, which might not be economically feasible without building a garage with additional parking spaces for others.
  - Had any due diligence been done to determine if multi-floor retail would be prohibitive; whether cross-prohibitive or just not convenient to shop?
    - From a market standpoint, retail was moving away from a large 50,000 to 100,000 sq ft formats, whether it was single or multi-story. Multi-story Targets were seen in large metropolitan areas, but in general, larger retailers, like Target and even Amazon, were moving into much smaller floorplate buildings, whether single or multi-story. A feasibility analysis had been done, and a three- to four-story Target in Wilsonville Town Center would not financially pencil out in the next 5 years. On the 20-year horizon, it could be feasible, but the retail environment would shift significantly in the 20-year timeframe.
    - Were shoppers comfortable shopping in a two-story 50,000 sq ft facility with 25,000 on each floor?
      - The Target at Mall 205 with an 80,000 sq ft floorplate over two stories. From the retailer's standpoint, the idea was to maximize whatever space they got. The concern seemed to be about the overall scale and less to do with heights.
      - From the feasibility analysis, a multi-story office and multi-story commercial were challenging within the environment right now.
  - A brief discussion ensued about the market and the ability of businesses to adapt, which was not a Code issue but it did affect the scale of buildings.

- It was a Code issue in that the City had to code for the possibility of change and provide flexibility, adaptability, and resiliency to market trends. It was important not to code so tightly as to limit that flexibility.
- The Commission's input was summarized as follows:
  - A maximum square footage per floor was wanted, but that did not mean one had to build to that maximum. Building multiple stories would provide flexibility to build more square footage within certain areas of Town Center.
  - More flexibility would be allowed in the C-MU District, and limitations should still exist in the MSD.
- Was there a desire for a shift in the mixed-use sub-district, and would that only be in locations along the edges?
  - The two mixed-use districts along Wilsonville Rd felt very different than the mixed-use district on the north end, so perhaps something different should be done there. Having something like an anchor store would get people there, and then they could walk within the area.
  - That approach could be taken should the Commission choose to do so. The MSD had tighter design guidelines at the intersection by Memorial Park, since that was a critical place. The language could also state, "within the mixed-use district along or adjacent to Wilsonville Rd."
- Perhaps the area adjacent to Wilsonville Rd should be C-MU.
  - C-MU allowed for a lot more building height. Combining the two could result in five- or six-story buildings if there was residential. The Town Center Plan stated higher buildings alongside I-5, and there was no proposal to change that.
    - The mixed-use district was pretty open as far as what was permitted. There were some scale limitations, but it was two to four stories and allowed most everything; however, the drive-through was the question primarily for the mixed-use district adjacent to Wilsonville Rd. Perhaps that was the differentiation between Wilsonville Rd and the district in the northeast quadrant, just from a road visibility standpoint.
- The Commission did not want four-story buildings along Wilsonville Rd.
- The Commission supported allowing a floorplans greater than 30,000 up to 50,000 sq ft for an anchor store specifically within the mixed-use adjacent to Wilsonville Rd with some limitations on the frontage design. Maximum frontage and block size limitations did exist outside of the MSD.
- Businesses on Wilsonville Rd would be accessed from roads in the back, so design would be very critical.
  - The design standards for the Wilsonville Rd frontage would be reviewed to ensure not a lot of parking was fronting on Wilsonville Rd, particularly at the street corners, to keep the entrance into Town Center attractive. The project team would report back at the next work session.
  - Wilsonville Rd needed to have texture; open, undulating, and inviting spaces, so it was not just a wall of glass with fake storefronts.
    - Old Town provided a great example of intent versus implementation. Several stores had put brown paper up in the windows along Boones Ferry Rd. Wilsonville Rd was susceptible to that because there would be no on-street parking to activate the streetscape. In Old Town, there was no reason for people to be back there because parking was on the other side. Fortunately, the streets on Wilsonville Rd were more closely spaced in the proposal which might be easier to mitigate.
  - The traffic could also be a problem. Walking and sitting along Wilsonville Rd was not incentivizing, and it could be a pretty stark space, potentially.
    - The streets perpendicular to Wilsonville Rd were really where the activity would happen. Wilsonville Rd would remain busy; there was no reason to be there. From an environment standpoint, people would prefer to be on Park Place or Town Center Loop W. The team would put some thought into it and present a proposal to the Commission.
  - Wilsonville Rd should have vistas that invite people into Town Center, as opposed to a wall.
- A number of drive-through facilities existed within the Town Center, and currently, design guidelines were provided for drive-throughs within the proposed Code.

- Mr. Dupey understood from the Commission that drive-throughs would be permitted on the periphery, but not on Main Street, provided design guidelines were provided to help with the pedestrian qualities. The drive-throughs would likely be on Town Center Loop W, where there was visibility. Town Center Loop W would change from its current traffic pattern. If Wilsonville Rd changed, no left turn would be permitted onto Town Center Loop W, but it could still be accessed coming from the east.
- The Commission discussed the purposes, pros and cons of having drive-throughs in Town Center. Key comments regarded the negative impacts on traffic, walkability, and the vision for Town Center, as well as the positive need for creating destinations and economic viability.
- The Commission agreed drive-throughs should be prohibited in the Main Street District, but permitted in the mixed-use areas along Town Center Loop East and West with design requirement to improve pedestrian qualities.
  - Drive-throughs were permissible along Wilsonville Rd, but would not have access to Wilsonville Rd, which was similar to the existing design pattern with access coming from Town Center Loop W.
  - Drive-throughs were initially prohibited due to public opinion regarding safety concerns, particularly with existing drive-through facilities. The language allowing existing facilities to continue was to get at the concept of creating value when something was prohibited. Allowing businesses to redevelop and reincorporate the drive-through made the property more valuable and more likely to be redeveloped, provided the design standards were met, as opposed to prohibiting any altogether because the drive-through would not be allowed with redevelopment.
    - During lengthy conversations with the public, there was almost unanimous concern about having any drive-throughs near the neighborhood mixed-use.
  - Traffic and safety were primary concerns, especially with access to drive-throughs that were too deep on the east or west loop.
    - The public was clear regarding the transition from residential into Town Center. The ideal location for drive-throughs would be from Town Center Loop W, where they were now.
  - One way to keep from having a row of drive-throughs would be to limit the proximity or spacing of them.
- Traffic had been discussed at the last Planning Commission meeting, and addressed with a new system that worked better than what was proposed in the Transportation System Plan (TSP). That presentation could be provided again at a later date if needed.
- The parking draft was revised to clarify questions raised at the last meeting.
  - Parking was still a grave concern, especially the off-site parking and how that would affect the viability of the plans for businesses and customers. It would affect residential especially, which was very important in regards to feet-on-the-ground to provide viability to businesses.
  - More discussion was needed about the residential planning in Town Center and parking for residents in particular. Clarification was also needed about the viability of off-premises parking at any distance from the residential premises.
    - Currently, the language for residential uses stated that one parking space per unit was required on the site of the development, and more parking could be provided on the site. If additional overflow parking was provided, it could be located off-site. The current Code allowed parking within 500 ft of a development. The subject Code expanded that a bit more to include the Town Center boundary due to the amount of unused existing parking.
    - To catalyze development, it was important to provide every opportunity to not overbuild supply on a single site, but then also provide the opportunity for the person coming in and taking the biggest risk with the first project to allow some flexibility in how parking was addressed by allowing the existing adjacent parking to be used.
    - The Town Center Plan would also allow flexibility later so when development did occur and there was opportunity to partner on some type of parking facility, like a garage, that any use adjacent to that garage could potentially utilize a portion of those parking spaces, and pay into it. That would be another opportunity for a share of or overflow parking in addition to the existing

requirements. The proposed requirements would allow flexibility now when adequate parking existed, but also set up the ability to use the same type of standard to use other types of parking when more feasible in the Town Center.

- Parking would shift over time as the area transitioned and based on how Town Center developed over time, which was difficult to predict. A parking management plan was recommended, as well as a more detailed analysis as Town Center evolved, all of which would be described in the full draft plan presented in January.
- In response to a request for the Commission to receive the entire draft Town Center Plan early, the project team offered to send completed portions of the Plan for the Commission to review as a refresher; however, the holiday schedule was a factor.

#### **IV. INFORMATIONAL**

##### **A. City Council Action Minutes (October 1 & 15, 2018)**

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, addressed two written questions presented by Commissioner Hurley with these comments:

- 5G wireless was discussed at the last Council work session. New FCC regulations were going into effect in mid-January that would apply to all municipalities, counties, and cities across the U.S. and the City was hard pressed to respond to the new regulations. The cell tower ordinance was overhauled two years ago to address the new regulations at that time.
  - The new regulations addressed a number of issues, and the most challenging for cities were the changes to the shot clock, the timeframes by which a city must issue an approval for 5G requests. The amount that cities were allowed to collect for utilization of the public right-of-way was also being reduced to a very low level.
  - The City regulated aesthetics and had concerns with four primary carriers, all of which had their own technology, were independent and working on their own to install the new 5G networks. While everyone wanted to see that rolled out, the cell towers were coming into neighborhoods and right near houses. There were aesthetic challenges as some of the designs did not look very good. One intersection corner could have four different carriers on four different poles, all with large, ground-mounted utility boxes with wires, cables, and antennae arrays on existing light poles. Wilsonville undergrounds all of its utilities, so the City had significant aesthetic concerns about what this would do to the landscape.
  - Staff was working expeditiously at trying to get aesthetic standards in place, and coming up with fee schedules that would generate enough cost recovery for utilization of the public right-of-way, as well as creating new processes not currently included on the City's application forms to address even shorter timeframes and shot clocks.
  - The shot clock would be down to 60 days from the time a carrier submitted its deployment application to Staff. If the City did not respond at exactly the right moment, the towers become de facto approved and could be constructed.
- Staff was trying to quickly learn as much as possible. Jonathan Kramer, a lawyer and electrical engineer was helping Staff modify the Public Work standards in an attempt to underground as much of the 5G Wireless as possible. They would also be creating clean, simple, aesthetically pleasing designs, then brace from the blow-back from the companies who would disagree.

Ms. Guile-Hinman clarified the application was not necessarily deemed approved if the City missed the shot clock. Missing the deadline would be used as presumptive evidence that the City was trying to prohibit these towers from coming into the City, subjecting the City to a lot of penalties if sued. Staff was working diligently to ensure the City was compliant before January 14<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Neamtzu added there was no time to run a normal process; in fact Council might need to consider an emergency ordinance to get the needed modifications in place by January 14<sup>th</sup>. Applications could be

submitted within the gap when an ordinance would become effective. Staff would get the minimum in place, and then have a longer process with a more robust conversation.

Ms. Guile-Hinman confirmed the rules were voted on September 25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup> and went into effect in October. The City did not have a lot of guidance regarding the changes, so Mr. Kramer was very valuable.

Mr. Neamtzu added lawsuits have already been filed by major metropolitan cities across the U.S. Lawyers did not believe it would be stayed, and it that would go into effect in mid-January, with the litigation continuing thereafter. The administration desired to have these things in place very quickly, and there was a lot of momentum behind the effort.

- The second question regarded the Aurora Airport. Council had scheduled a public hearing regarding matter on November 27<sup>th</sup>, and the community was invited to speak about the airport expansion proposal.
  - He explained that the airport did a master plan about 10 years ago, and some gerrymandering of the boundary occurred with regard to which parties or agencies would be affected. Clackamas County and Wilsonville were excluded from that process, from an intergovernmental agreement, and were not afforded an adequate opportunity to participate in some of those processes.
  - Now, there was a \$37 million federal government grant for a 1,000 ft airport runway expansion. City Council was concerned and had been on the record for over a decade about that issue. Staff could provide written material regarding that issue to the Commission.
  - The public hearing was merely a venue for people to be heard so that information could be communicated to the Emergency Board making the decision on the \$34 million grant request. Oregon Solutions was doing an assessment with all the various parties and were talking to all the municipalities, aviation, special interests, and collecting a ton of information.
  - City Council wanted to be sure the community at large had an opportunity to be heard on these issues. Everyone was invited, including federal and state aviation boards, business interests, etc. but whether they would choose to come remained to be seen. The hearing would be held in Council Chambers at City Hall, and people would have to provide comments in stages due to the expected amount of attendance. Further questions should be directed to Mark Ottenad, the City's Public/Government Affairs Director.
- He announced that Nancy Kraushaar would be retiring in late November. It had been amazing working with such a tremendously talented, energetic, enlightened civil engineer who appreciated planning. She would be missed. Details about any celebratory event would be sent to the Commission.

Commissioner Heberlein noted there was no information on the City website regarding the airport expansion. He did not see how the City expected residents to be informed about the City's position when no background information was provided.

Chair Greenfield confirmed the City was asserting its views about the expansion.

Commissioner Heberlein said his concern was that the City had made its opinion known, but was not giving the public the information to be able to validate or dispute that position.

Mr. Neamtzu confirmed a lot of written material had been submitted to various groups and organizations about the City's position. He agreed to talk to Mr. Ottenad about the website and ensure that at least the position papers were posted for public consumption.

Commissioner Springall noted there was a Mayor's letter with a number of attachments that was rather informative. There was also a joint letter from the City and County previously.

Commissioner Postma assumed that counter information was available. Historic economic reports and other position papers should be available as well.

Commissioner Springall commented he would like to see that.

Chair Greenfield noted an area in the Frog Pond development had been chosen for the Homebuilders Association NW Natural Street of Dreams, which was a tremendous kick-start to that development.

- Mr. Neamtzu noted there were a lot of fast-moving pieces on that. Staff met with the development team today, and currently, there were three builders and four homes that had been secured, but they hoped to get as many as eight out of the show, which would start July 25 and run through the month of August.
- The Homebuilders Association actually operated the show. A lot needed to be done in record time, including paving during winter, signing plats, and providing for at least seven months for the construction of the homes. The Development Review Board's role was done with the approval of Phase 1 of the Stafford Meadows Subdivision, now Staff was trying to establish new digital submittals and rapid turnaround times. It was exciting to be on the cutting edge of the project.
- He confirmed the builders could choose any one of the 25 lots located along Boeckman Rd and in the first block in along Willow Creek Dr to be part of the Street of Dreams.

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:19 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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