

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

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

*Minutes approved as  
presented  
3/8/2017*

**Minutes**

---

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

Chair Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. Those present:

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

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Miranda Bateschell, Daniel Pauly, Eric Mende

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT**

No City Council Liaison Report was given due to Councilor Lehan's absence.

**CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES**

A. Consideration of the January 18, 2017 Planning Commission minutes  
The January 18, 2017 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

**II. INFORMATIONAL**

- A. Water Treatment Plant Master Plan Hearing Cancellation (Mende)  
The Water Treatment Plant Master Plan has been withdrawn. The City will be preparing a mini-master plan for consideration. Please watch for updates on the project website [www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/WTPMPupdate](http://www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/WTPMPupdate)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, noted a number of things changed since the Commission's January meeting, and Staff withdrew the Water Treatment Plant Master Plan project. He cited the Master Plan document's complexity, given its inclusion of many items that applied to other jurisdictions and only some applying to Wilsonville. He announced that any citizen present to hear or participate in the public hearing for the Master Plan could leave since the item had been withdrawn.

Eric Mende, Capital Projects Engineering Manager, presented a brief update on the Water Treatment Plant Master Plan via PowerPoint, highlighting the goals, issues, and next steps of the Master Plan, which would address the future water demands of the six partners involved: the Cities of Wilsonville, Sherwood, Beaverton, Hillsboro, and Tigard, and the Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD). After discovering the need for safety, seismic, and other upgrades to the existing plant, a more site specific Mini-Master Plan would be developed that would also consider plans for the next logical expansion of the plant, increasing output to 22.5 million gallons a day. The Mini-Master Plan was expected to come before the Planning Commission in the fall.

- B. Traffic Improvements (Mende)

Eric Mende, Capital Projects Engineering Manager, described the Exit 283 Congestion Improvement Projects via PowerPoint in response to the Commission's request for information about how the City was working to address traffic congestion, namely in the Wilsonville Rd/I-5 Interchange area.

He responded to questions and additional comments from the Commission were as follows:

- None of the projects done in Wilsonville would have a major impact on the congestion.
- While the additional stacking lane on the southbound I-5 ramp would only accommodate about 40 vehicles, it was not an issue of moving one traffic light's worth of vehicles as much as it was moving traffic off Wilsonville Rd to allow some of the free traffic going east-west to get out of the way to help with the congestion. The cost-benefit economics of the additional stacking lane was a City Council decision, but Council did want Staff to move forward with the design work. The key was the Boone Bridge; if vehicles could not get across the Boone Bridge, the stacking lane on the southbound ramp would not help.
- Although the same number of north and south lanes exist on I-5 between Salem and downtown Portland, the bottleneck likely occurred at the Boone Bridge due to traffic jockeying for position to get over to get off or on I-5 at the southbound ramps. The problem was not the bridge itself, but drivers not leaving space for others to get in and out, which slowed traffic and caused the congestion. Exacerbating the situation were the Miley Rd and Hubbard exits south of the Boone Bridge.
  - A November *Boones Ferry Messenger* article corroborated the two exits south of Wilsonville were adding to the congestion as well as the large number of exits in a very short distance.
- Concern was expressed about preserving a sufficient bike lane with the change in the striping for Projects 1 and 4, the two lane adjustments on Boones Ferry Rd.
  - Mr. Mende clarified the Boones Ferry Rd Re-stripe Project had no changes to the bike lanes, while the modification at the Fred Meyer Exit made the second lane a combined traffic/bike lane with sharrows, although the bike lane just past the crosswalk would be eliminated. A wider alternative with a full bike lane and two traffic lanes was considered; however, it was significantly more expensive and time-consuming.
  - If vehicles were backed up clear to the crosswalk, it would force bicyclists onto the sidewalk. Staff has received a number of reports of sidewalk, bike, and pedestrian conflicts in the entire walkable area, which included several retail shops. Unfortunately, there were no great solutions to the problem at this time.
  - It was important for the City needed to provide good access for all modes of transportation.
  - Directing bicyclists to go up on the sidewalk at that crosswalk and installing an off ramp from the sidewalk back into the bike lane when it resumed would result in minimal conflict all around.
- The second exit from the Fred Meyer shopping center also became congested when everything else was backed up. Staff has heard reports of people unable to even get out of the Fred Meyer parking lot at times.
- While a significant amount of money was being spent for very little benefit, in some people's opinions, the City had to do something about the congestion. Council decided to move forward with something and these were the projects Staff proposed. There simply was no magic bullet solution to the problem.

### III. WORK SESSION

#### A. Frog Pond Master Plan (Neamtzu) (Attachment: Citizen Communication)

The following handout was distributed to the Planning Commission:

- Letter dated February 3, 2017 from Ben Altman, Pioneer Design Group, Inc.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated the project team had been very responsive to issues raised during their discussions with the development community and had made many improvements to the Development Code language. He noted the correspondence he had received was included in the packet for the Commission's review. He had been unable to respond to Mr. Altman's letter in time for tonight's hearing, but his responses to all the comments received would be included in the March public hearing record.

- He and Mr. Dills had a very good, hour-long work session with City Council on the Frog Pond Master Plan. Council appreciated the Planning Commission's hard work and believed the project team was on the right track with the Master Plan document. Council would see the Development Code language for the first time on March 6<sup>th</sup>, along with information on the infrastructure finance work. A number of work sessions have been held with the development community regarding draft concepts on the infrastructure financing and a second round of interviews was scheduled for next week. The Commission would receive that information in a compendium piece to the Frog Pond Master Plan document, along with proposed Comprehensive Plan and Development Code language amendments, extensive findings supporting approval, and documentation regarding compliance with the Title XI Metro Functional Plan and Transportation Planning Rule Analysis.
- The March 8<sup>th</sup> hearing schedule was contingent upon whether City Council agreed with the draft Development Code language at its March 6 meeting. The City Council public hearing on the Frog Pond Master Plan was scheduled for April 17<sup>th</sup> to provide some flexibility in case the Commission or City Council wanted extra time to review the Master Plan.

Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group (APG), outlined the revisions to the draft Code text of the Residential Neighborhood Zone, as noted in the work session agenda provided on Page 1 of 68 of the packet.

Discussion, key comments, and responses to questions from the Commission regarding the Code revisions were as follows:

- Section 4.127(.07)C.4 Lot Development Standards. The design standards specified a minimum 4-ft depth for front porches, which would prevent the construction of a 2-ft porch. For houses designed with a front stoop, the garage recess was measured from the front of the house, not from the stoop. (Page 6 of 21)
- Section 4.127(.08)B.2 Open Space. The three options proposed for open space standards were outlined in the comments section on Page 8 of 21.
  - Mr. Dills confirmed the Small Lot area between the new school site and the Boeckman Creek Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) with green space on either side would be redeveloped as one section.
  - Commissioner Springall believed the proposed changes of Option 2 clearly provided for flexibility and discretion by the Development Review Board (DRB). Given the very different areas of Small Lot development, some Small Lot areas might not have much adjacent green space, so it made sense that the standard should be very flexible. He was reluctant to strike the standard.
  - Mr. Neamtzu clarified the strikeout in B.2.c was intended as "~~4,000~~ 2,000 square feet".
  - Commissioner Levit said there was a huge amount of discretion built into the Open Space standard, but he was not sure how it would happen. It might not be presented that the DRB has the discretion to make changes, so it needed to be done carefully. He was also uncomfortable with the larger red insertion in B.2.a, which seemed very circular in reasoning. [46:10]
  - Mr. Dills clarified the "at least 50%" in B.2.a meant that at least 50% of the required open space must be usable open space, as defined at the end of the section. The 10% rule related to the subject property under review, regardless of the number of parcels comprising the property.
  - Commissioner Levit suggested including a provision that two separate developments could have their individual 10% open spaces abut each other to create a larger open space area, though he was uncertain how it would be done.
    - Commissioner Postma suggested using Mr. Altman's language to set a standard that if a property was X number of feet away from another open space, the developer could see some reduction in their open space requirement. He agreed it was difficult to predict, but if a project was within 600 ft of open space, which could include the public facility open space at the school, then the developer could see some reduction.
    - Commissioner Levit clarified he was not talking about any reduction or lumping open space requirements together, but rather setting two separate 10% open spaces next to each other to create a larger facility. While he could see some accountability for SubArea 1 because it would

be surrounded by non-buildable, usable green space, he did not want to eliminate the open space requirement because pedestrian walkways and connections would be needed.

- Mr. Dills explained this Code style linked such decisions back to the Purpose Statement. The idea of connecting green spaces could be added into the Purpose language as a desired outcome which the DRB would determine. One possible scenario that would be guided by the language, in which Developer 1 put his open space in between the School's open space and the SROZ and Developer 2 provided the linkage. One possible scenario that would be guided by the language was Developer 1 would put his open space between the school's open space and the SROZ, and Developer 2 would provide the linkages between the open space areas. [52:30]
- Miranda Bateschell, Long-Range Planning Manager, suggested the language under Purpose (.08)A.3.c (Page 7 of 21) to provide access and connections to trails and adjacent open space areas might address Commissioner Levit's concern.
- Commissioner Mesbah said he considered usable recreational facilities of (.08)A.1 as more important to have usable open space for Small Lots because the Small Lots would not have a yard. Neither the SROZ or school site was necessarily good for those under school age. The school's security concerns would likely prevent the use of the school's facilities as active recreational opportunities for non-students during operational hours.
  - He preferred having a functional criterion instead of a percentage so the DRB could consider what functional opportunities were available nearby when determining whether to require open space. Continuing to add the 10% open space requirement to each property effectively reduced the density the City wanted to maintain. He would rather not have open space unnecessarily, which made him question why open space was required, though the three criteria, including active recreation, were helpful. [55:32]
- Commissioner Springall noted "the City *may require up to 10%*" was a significant change in wording and served as a guideline, allowing developers to justify why the 10% requirement was not necessary.
- Commissioner Postma reiterated his preference to remove discretionary items, as "may include up to 10%" meant 1% if a developer could convince the DRB to let him have it, which transferred the legislative function from the Planning Commission and City Council to the DRB, which he was not comfortable doing. It also took away some of the predictability that streamlined the process for developers by providing a hard and fast rule to work with, even if they did not like it. The discretion of "may require up to 10%" became a meaningless standard in his opinion.
- Commissioner Levit concurred the standard could flex down to 0%. He was concerned the proposed language could result in the first development putting in 10% open space, and the next developer citing how close his property was to existing open spaces so that no open space was required. [57:20]
  - Commissioner Mesbah stated if the green space was close enough to be usable, he was fine with not requiring the 10% because it was not necessary.
  - Commissioner Levit clarified he was concerned about putting a different burden on each development.
  - Mr. Dills noted according to the existing tax lotting pattern, larger 5- and 10-acre properties would be involved in the beginning. There were not many small properties in the Small Lot open spaces today. [58:15]
- Commissioner Springall believed the existing natural resource areas in the Small Lot Subareas would most likely be the open space when those areas developed. There were many geographic elements to utilize, and A.2.b under Purpose should become the core of the guidelines provided to developers and the DRB.
  - Commissioner Levit noted wetlands and wooded areas were not usable recreational facilities.
  - Chair Greenfield added (.08) A.1.a required usable recreational facilities, which should be defined as broad as possible, but no definition existed.

- The Commission discussed whether the three purposes under (.08)A Purpose (Page 7 of 21) should be read as “or” or “and”. Requiring all three purposes could be overly restrictive. Without “and” or “or”, one must assume the principles were mutually exclusive and not connected.
  - Mr. Dills clarified the Purpose Statements were intended to be complementary and reflected a broad vision for the open space. Sometimes the three statements worked in sync and sometimes one was a little weightier than the others. He encouraged the Commission to pick the option that best balanced the various concerns.
  - Commissioner Postma stated if the language was changed to Option 2, [1:02:15] he suggested the Commission provide factors for the DRB to consider outside of the Purpose statements, such as proximity. He agreed with Commissioner Mesbah that houses should be close enough to functional open space, rather than making only the unusable natural resource areas into open space. [1:03:00]
- Chair Greenfield preferred requiring 10% open space as the norm, not up to 10%. The waivers list in the Planned Development Residential (PDR) Code provided a laundry list of areas where the DRB could make exceptions. The Commission was setting the ‘normal’ standard in the Code that was subject to specific waivers or deviations based on whatever case the developer and the City believed was reasonable.
  - Mr. Dills stated the existing 10% standard was specific about what the waivers applied to while allowing a waiver for open space within the zone. He suggested stating the factors that would be considered for a waiver, which would include proximity to open space and the presence of functional or usable open space.
- The Commission discussed providing creative experiences along trails and in wooded settings, similar to what was done in Villebois.
  - Mr. Neamtzu confirmed ‘creative play’ was a defined category in the Villebois Master Plan, which allowed ‘nature play’ to be implemented in Villebois in a meaningful way. Examples included incorporating exercise stations and small interactive elements for kids.
  - The suggestion was made to transfer the language about creative play areas along trails and in tree groves from the Villebois Master Plan over to the Frog Pond Master Plan.
- Chair Greenfield reiterated his preference for removing ‘up to’ from the language, using the “will require” approach and waivers as opposed to the “may require” approach.
- Mr. Dills confirmed the Commission’s direction on Open Space was to remove the “may require” language and retain to the original 10% open space requirement, utilizing the PDR waiver process for flexibility, and include factors to consider, such as proximity to open space, usability of open space, and creative play. If a waiver was granted, at least 50 percent of the open space must be usable.
  - The preservation of natural resources was in the Purpose statement and not a factor for obtaining a waiver. [1:09:08]
  - Edits made to (.08)B.2.b, 2.c, and 2.d would be retained, which included allowing pedestrian connections to satisfy the requirement.
- With all the exclusions, like natural resources, land for streets, etc., resulting in a smaller piece of developable land, it was unlikely 50% open space could be provided with the 10% requirement. Having SROZ or other natural resources would trigger the possibility of a waiver request, which would include factors for the DRB to consider.
  - Mr. Dills confirmed the developer still had to provide some usable space, even with any natural resource areas counting towards the 10%.
  - A developer could still provide 10% open space through the SROZ, but request that the active component be waived. A waiver could be granted in relation to proximity considerations. The intent was for most of the homes to be close to an active space.
- Section 4.127(.011) Parking.
  - Concern was expressed about the principle of dealing with issues like parking generally through the City’s existing Development Code rather than addressing specific standards for Frog Pond in the Master

Plan. If the City changed the citywide parking standards in the future, it could not then apply them retroactively to Frog Pond. The Commission should do what it thought best for Frog Pond now, instead of doing something less than optimal simply because it should be done in the larger Code. The Commission should deal with the particular in view of what the general ought to be. The proposed language was fine, but setting that precedent in how the City did planning was concerning.

- Given the street parking available with the average frontage width of the Small Lots being 50 ft, in addition to any driveway parking, it was questionable whether there would be parking problems.
  - Car saturation and future transportation concepts like driverless cars were also considerations.
  - The phrase “well-connected street grid” was already contained within the Purpose Statement (09).A, which spoke of “a cohesive and connected pattern of streets.”
  - Given that potential obstacles like tree groves, wetlands, and existing houses were not indicated on the street grid, the possibility of creating dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs existed. Dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs should not be allowed, or at least minimized.
    - Mr. Dill explained obstacles would be considered on a case-by-case basis. The standard required substantially equivalent connectivity in the event of an obstruction. At a minimum, a developer would be required to provide pedestrian and bike connectivity in the case of a dead-end street. There might also be opportunity to align the streets differently so the obstruction was more interior to a block, for example.
      - Staff did consider the location of tree groves and other situations when drawing up the street grid. Some of the pedestrian connections were explicitly located where good tree groves or the potential wetlands in the eastern part of the neighborhood existed.
      - He clarified the location of the grove of Oaks seen from Stafford Rd, as well as another significant tree grove that was considered when developing the circulation.
      - He confirmed the proposed language was written to maintain as much connectivity as possible.
- Section 4.127(.013) Main Entrances, (.014) Garages, and (.015) Residential Design Standards.
  - Mr. Dills deferred questions about siding alternatives, such as Hardie Board, aluminum, and vinyl to West Hills Development. Aluminum could be added as a prohibited material, if desired.
    - Discussion included the pros and cons of various siding types. Cementitious siding was the most common type used in Wilsonville. Over time, vinyl siding colors fade significantly and the siding becomes brittle. Hardie Board required more maintenance. Aluminum siding came in a ribbed corrugated style and in an interlocking style similar to vinyl. [1:30:15]
  - Concern was expressed that the change of the double-car garage door width to a maximum of 50% of the house façade in (.014)B.3.b.i could effectively reduce the other half of the house to something smaller compared to the original requirement.
    - Mr. Dills clarified that with the recess, the total package should look fine given the goals of having the visual connection to the street, the emphasis of the semi-public space, and non-dominance of the garage.
  - Mr. Dills clarified the intent of “oddly shaped area” in the definition of usable open space was to prohibit little narrow spaces, such as the long pointy part of a triangular space, from being counted as usable open space.
  - Mr. Neamtzu explained developers typically did not include such small odd pieces in the adjacent lot in order to meet the 25% open space requirement. The remnants were considered beautification or landscape tracts and were owned by the homeowners associations (HOA).
- While creative play was to be included as a factor for a waiver, it should also be added in the definition of useable open space. [1:34:41]
  - Creative play was helpful in Villebois where some odd pieces of land that were not very useful were able to accommodate fun, creative uses to create an entirely different experience.

Chair Greenfield called for public comment.

Dorothy Von Eggers, 6567 SW Stratford Court, Wilsonville, said that she lived in the Landover subdivision bordering Frog Pond. She asked if the 4-ft brick wall with the 2-ft iron railing on top that was to be built along Boeckman Rd would provide sufficient privacy for the backyards of those homes, especially given the pedestrians on the adjoining sidewalks.

Mr. Neamtzu responded that Monday night the City Council discussed how to buffer a backyard along the Boeckman Rd frontage. The conclusion was to do so using vegetation, such as an arborvitae hedge, to screen the backyard if the wall did not provide sufficient privacy. The intent was not to have wooden fences behind the more opaque walls and fences as seen in Villebois. He clarified the City would not require the HOA or developer to provide the vegetation as that would be left to the homeowner. The City had required that arborvitae be planted in certain situations, but some of the shrubs often die within big blocks that are planted, which looked worse than just having the fence and some trees. The Commission could direct if extra vegetation should be required.

Ms. Von Eggers responded that the 4-ft brick wall would be subpar. She expressed concern that the 4-ft wall be set deep enough in the ground to help absorb the vibrations from trucks and school buses traveling along Boeckman Rd.

Mr. Neamtzu deferred to engineers on the depth of the wall, noting the wall would have to have an engineered footing to support the brick structure. Also, the houses would be substantially farther from the road than the houses in the Landover neighborhood because the rear setbacks on the larger lots were much deeper. There would also be a landscape tract between the road and the ~~road~~ right-of-way and then the wall.

Ms. Von Eggers said she was happy to see in writing that the relocation of the commercial property at the Four Corners would be subject to further study, as there had been much testimony regarding the concern of having a commercial store close to the middle school. She noted that she continues to see the commercial property at the Four Corners in the Frog Pond materials.

Chair Greenfield confirmed the City would keep the public informed about the issue, adding that the entire East Neighborhood was subject to further study.

Don Hanson, OTAK, 808 SW 3<sup>rd</sup> Suite 300, Portland, OR 97204, spoke on behalf of West Hills Development. He said the developers appreciated the progress that had been made and Staff's ability to respond quickly to the School District's plan to build the school and shape the plan to accommodate the school.

- He had intended to demand Option 3, the elimination of the open space requirement, but the Commission's discussion about flexibility and building standards that would fit the site changed his mind to strongly support Option 2. He acknowledged that there might be challenges regulating the standard and making it work on the ground, but he believed the intent was good.
- He noted West Hills Development used Hardie Board in all of their quality housing projects, as it was durable, it held paint, and it looked good over the long-term. The developers would use Hardie Board in Frog Pond as it was expected in this quality of a neighborhood.
  - Aluminum was not recommended because it was not durable, the paint faded, and dents could not be removed. Though inexpensive, vinyl was not recommended either because it warped, it blew off in windstorms, and it did not fit the quality intended for the neighborhood or the price level for the homes.
- The developers appreciated that the garage door dimension changed, as that really influenced the visual appearance of the front of the house. They wanted to do double-car garages wherever possible as double-car garages were expected at the price level and given the low-density intended for this neighborhood.
- He described building the brick wall, noting the wall would be built below frost level, about 12-inches below ground, the footing below that would extend about 8 inches into the ground and spread 2 to 3 ft equally on each side. He confirmed this alone would have a dampening effect, but the real dampening effect would be

the amount of landscape space between the moving lanes and the homes. They did not anticipate the vibrations being an issue.

- The developers also appreciated that the parking situation had been revisited, as they did not think it would be an issue in a neighborhood of this density.
- He concluded that West Hills was now advocates of the Frog Pond Master Plan and they appreciated Staff working with them on some of the details.

#### IV. OTHER BUSINESS

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

Miranda Bateschell, Long-Range Planning Manager, described the upcoming Town Center Plan Kick-Off Event, which would be held February 28<sup>th</sup> at City Hall with light refreshments provided. The City Hall doors would open at 5:30 pm with the program beginning at 6:00 pm. The event provided an opportunity to start engaging the citizens in a conversation about what the community envisioned for the Town Center in 5 to 20 years from now. A short presentation would be followed by small group exercises and interactive activities for adults and kids to learn how they used Town Center, how they got there, what was or was not working, the Town Center's strengths, what they might want changed, etc. A video station and poster exercises would be used to gather input, and informational materials would also be available.

- The project team sent postcards to every doorstep and business located in the Town Center, and also put announcements in the *Boones Ferry Messenger*, the Charbonneau newsletter, media releases, and on Facebook. Staff intended to continue sending out invitations to get as many people from the community involved as possible. She had additional postcards for the Commission to distribute as well.
- She addressed comments and questions from the Commission as follows:
  - Staff would highlight the kids' zone and activities available for the kids to participate on Facebook to encourage families to attend who might not normally engage with the City.
  - The event was also being advertised in Spanish and Spanish translation would be available as well as other language translation services with a 48-hour notice.
  - Staff was looking into contacting the middle and high schools to see about opportunities for some of the open house activities with the students, such as during the lunch hour or a leadership class. Staff planned to do a few satellite events in different locations with different groups that might not be able to attend the Kick-Off Event.
  - Staff did not have direct contact information for high school students, but invitations were being sent to the high school principals, and the high school student on the project task force was asked to share the information with people she knows at the school. Staff agreed it was important to get continuous input from high school students.

Ms. Bateschell thanked the Commissioners for attending either the discussion with Bob Gibbs or the Happy Hour. Since Mr. Gibbs provided expertise on the project team around what was achievable from a market perspective in the Town Center related to commercial uses, it was good the Commissioners were able to engage in dialogue with him. The success of this project depended on the number of perspectives brought to the table about what people wanted, what was achievable, and what would work for the community.

- She reviewed the next steps and answered Commissioner questions as follows:
  - She explained that Mr. Gibbs would revise his initial market analysis findings based on the information he gained while here, and would continue partnering with Leland Consulting Group on the full market analysis, which would be in the existing conditions.
    - Once the project team had worked with the community on visioning and goals, the team would begin looking at different alternatives, such as different types of uses, development patterns, and scales that might fit the community's vision, and then do a market analysis to determine which of those would or would not work.
  - Mr. Gibbs would also be involved on the opportunity analyses on some specific sites. The team would consider the opportunities for two or three specific sites, as well as what was or was not achievable

from a market perspective, the related costs for achieving the vision, and the gap between the two, if one existed.

- The team wanted to see how the process worked for the two design workshops in the summer before deciding whether it was most beneficial for Mr. Gibbs to return when Staff made the initial recommendations or after Staff had done some refinements and more details were being discussed. She anticipated that Mr. Gibbs would return in the fall, but the intent was to bring him back to Wilsonville when it made the most sense in the project and when it would be most useful to have another dialogue with him.

Commissioner Postma:

- Suggested that the traffic analysis come to the Commission for discussion early on, so it could be a framing point for all later discussions, which would help avoid having to rethink a pie-in-the-sky design because it jammed up the streets.
- Ms. Bateschell said the Existing Conditions study in progress now would come to the Commission along with some findings from the initial visioning before anything else at the joint City Council/Planning Commission work session.
  - The Existing Conditions would include existing traffic counts and analysis, as well as a baseline showing what the transportation network would be able to handle at the 2035 planning horizon given normal development of vacant parcels, etc., under the City's current zoning. The project team would be able to compare that information to the alternatives developed later this year.
  - The joint work session would be a good time to discuss the differences between the baseline and the vision, and what Council and the Commission believe additional uses might do. However, when land uses change, trips may increase or decrease, depending on the new use. [1:58:55]
- Observed people could talk themselves into the traffic working out because they liked the design, which was his greatest concern. It was important to first look at what was possible and doable within a good traffic framework and then look at the design.
  - Ms. Bateschell reiterated the Commission would see the existing conditions first.

Ms. Bateschell offered project business cards for the Commissioners to hand to people when discussing the Town Center project or upcoming events. The cards had the project logo, website address, and a QR code.

- She explained the joint meeting with City Council shifted to May due to the time it took to pull the Task Force together and to find a first meeting date for them, which would be March 14<sup>th</sup>. Staff wanted two meetings with the Task Force prior to the joint City Council/Commission work session to work through the existing conditions, the public input received from the Kick-Off Event, and the information received from the online survey, which would remain open for four weeks after the Kick-Off Event.
- She confirmed the survey was map-based, making it easy to capture the respondents' demographics, especially where they lived and worked. Staff sent the postcard regarding the Kick-Off Event to every business and property owner in the Town Center Study Area as well as a one-third mile buffer to capture all the adjacent residential and business owners within walking distance of the Town Center. The three-mile radius buffer was part of Bob Gibbs' presentation about the primary trade or retail area, and there was a 10-mile secondary area as well.

## B. 2017 Planning Commission Work Program

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, confirmed there was nothing on the April agenda now that the Water Treatment Plant Master Plan was withdrawn and that the Transit Master Plan was expected to come to the Planning Commission in March. Transit Director Stephan Lashbrook was retiring, but he did not yet know who would be filling the Transit Director or Park and Recreation Director positions.

Commissioner Postma clarified he supported moving the Transit Master Plan to April because he believed additional review needed to be done before it was presented.

Mr. Neamtzu responded the regular April meeting date could be maintained for a possible continuation of the Transit Master Plan hearing.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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