

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

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

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

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

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

UPDATE ON LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS

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

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

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

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

II. LEGISLATIVE HEARING

A. Transit Master Plan Hearing

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Frog Pond Master Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Greenfield:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commissioner Postma:

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

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

Commissioner Levit:

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

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

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

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

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

Commissioner Postma:

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

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

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

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

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

Commissioner Springall:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Greenfield closed the public hearing.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. 2017 PC Work Program

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

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