

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2014
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Approved
August 13, 2014**

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Eric Postma, Al Levit, Phyllis Millan, Jerry Greenfield, and City Councilor Susie Stevens. Peter Hurley arrived during the first work session. Marta McGuire was absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, and Katie Mangle

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

Theonie Gilmore noted the 25-page concept plan for an arts and wellness center in Wilsonville was recently emailed to the Planning Commission and was presented to City Council by the Wilsonville Arts & Cultural Council in October 2009. With the Commission's full agenda, she said she wanted to reintroduce the concept to the Commission. The Wilsonville Arts & Cultural Council had done a year of work and gone through many old records. Wilsonville citizens have had a few aquatic task forces that the Commission likely knew about, but no performing arts venue existed in Wilsonville.

- When the high school was built in 1994, the Wilsonville Arts & Cultural Council was told the City would contribute some money to the auditorium in hopes that the community could use it, but the high school arts program had become so wonderful that the only time available for community use was in the summer, making it difficult to build any programming. This was why the concept plan was developed.
 - The I-5 Music Group has grown from about 20 members five years ago to more than 60 now. They did not have enough room to rehearse or have concerts. The group was very good and needed a place to perform, as every time they performed in the Community Center or anywhere else, the place was packed.
 - There were many groups that would love to perform, such as the Wilsonville Theatre Company, which has done very well at the Frog Pond Grange, but the stage is quite small.
- Wellness was a big discussion item in 2009. The concept plan mentioned that originally, the Arts & Cultural Council tried to get Kaiser Permanente involved, but Kaiser was too busy building its Hillsboro facility, so the Council did not pursue it any further. The Council had intended to use the property across the street from City Hall and have underground parking, so cars would not have to be parked outside the building. They planned to have a swimming pool on one side of the property with a concession area in between the swimming pool and an auditorium, but the concept plan had never gotten very far.
- She reiterated that she wanted the Commission to be aware of the concept plan and know that the materials had also been sent to City Council because some of them were not around when the plan was sent originally.
- She concluded that she was available for any questions the Commissioners might have and thanked the Commissioners for their time.

IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

A. City Council Update

Councilor Stevens reported that City Council:

- Unanimously approved adding median strips to the north section of Wilsonville Rd towards SW Stafford Rd. Median strips in Wilsonville Rd currently extend from the west side near Graham Oaks Nature Park, but no median strips were installed when the Landover and Arbor Crossing neighborhoods were built. During the last two Council meetings, citizens have commented about the speed in that area, especially drivers coming off Stafford Rd after the four-way stop. The idea was to install the median strips as a visual cue that drivers were now entering the city limits, which would hopefully reduce the speeds and traffic impact in that area, and resolve the residents' concerns. The addition of the median strips would be added to the 2014-15 Budget.
- Approved the Wilsonville Community Sharing Grant after receiving citizens' testimony.
- Passed the 2014-15 Budget.
- Held a lengthy work session where Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) presented Hillsboro's proposal for drawing water from the Willamette River and building another treatment plant.
 - She appreciated that TVWD had been updating Council during two or three work sessions on the matter. Most of the discussion regarded where the pipelines would be located, as the project meant major construction in the city once again, and determining the best routes was important. She noted the project was in its very early stages, but it would be a large one.
- Briefly discussed a comprehensive plan Staff put together regarding the significant deterioration of Charbonneau's infrastructure, its storm drainpipes, sewer lines and, to some degree, water lines in the streets. Staff proposed making the repairs during 38 smaller projects over a couple of decades. More about this plan would be made known and discussed at the July 21st meeting and then again in August.
- Discussed the closure of 110th Ave near Villebois, so that 100,000 cu yds of soil could be moved to create an entire new road; 110th Ave would not exist anymore and a new road would be built, but it was not safe to keep 110th open during the construction, because big vehicles would be crossing the road every two minutes. The four-month closure was unavoidable and would be much like the closure of the Boeckman Bridge and very inconvenient for many residents.
- She announced that the City recently launched a new, very comprehensive website for Economic Development that showcased Wilsonville's economic potential and what was happening now in terms of economic development and the companies currently located in Wilsonville

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated he would email the link for the new website to Councilor Stevens and the Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Levit commented that the 38 proposed projects in Charbonneau would amount to about one project per year.

- Councilor Stevens agreed, adding the projects were widespread and had smaller pieces; the project map looked like a puzzle. The idea was to minimize construction by doing sewer, storm and perhaps water all at the same time. The most damaged areas would have the highest priority and then projects where, perhaps just storm and sewer needed repair would be prioritized next, and so forth. The project would not be fun for the community, but Staff determined this was the best way to address such a huge project.
 - She noted 15 critical projects might be addressed first or, depending on what Council decided, folded into larger projects. A video of the inside of one storm drainpipe showed that it was blocked, as rocks had fallen down into it, things were growing inside of it, and water could not get through it anymore. There was still a lot to think grapple with on the project.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

A. Consideration of the May 14, 2014 Planning Commission minutes

The May 14, 2014 Planning Commission minutes were approved as presented by a 4 to 0 to 1 vote with Commissioner Postma abstaining.

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Frog Pond Area Plan (Mangle)

Katie Mangle, Manager, Long Range Planning, stated Staff had been working on the draft Vision Statement and Guiding Principles on the Frog Pond Area Plan over two meetings with the Task Force, which included Commissioners Greenfield and Millan, in addition to a number of other property owners and Wilsonville residents. The Opportunities & Constraints had been completed and, as Staff finalized the subject statements, the engineers were starting to quantify such things as infrastructure costs, and sketch out circulation patterns. Later this summer, Staff would start bringing some of the work that would start shaping what the area might look like to the Commission.

- She displayed “Opportunities & Constraints Exhibit 4: Planning Area” for the Frog Pond Area Plan, which set the tone for upcoming drawings and the work that would be reviewed in the fall. Exhibit 4 included everything that would be intended for the area. She requested the Commission’s feedback on the draft Vision Statement and Guiding Principles, which would be presented to Council on July 21. From these statements, Staff would develop metrics and performance measures to determine whether the vision was being achieved.

Ms. Mangle reviewed the Vision Statement, Guiding Principles and Process Principles of Attachment A, “A Vision For Frog Pond in 2035”, of the Frog Pond Area Plan, which was included in the packet. Commissioner feedback and discussion on these key elements, including responses and clarifications from Ms. Mangle, was as follows:

- Vision Statement
 - The word connected was used a lot; while clearly part of the concept, it seemed overly redundant.
 - Any mention of cars was notably absent.
 - The language, “a short connection to the rest of the city” was a bit misleading as Frog Pond sat way out by itself. While it would certainly be close and connected to that end of town, it would not be close to Charbonneau or Villebois, for example.
 - Although Boeckman Rd was a pretty direct connection, it was not a short route. No matter what was done within the site not much could be done about the location of the site with regard to the rest of the city.
 - Boeckman Creek provides green space; no plans were discussed for a vehicular crossing.
 - A trail was planned along Boeckman Creek and No. 9 on Exhibit 4 indicated a potential pedestrian crossing. The Canyon Creek Rd extension being constructed this summer would also be an important connection from the neighborhood to Town Center.
 - Compared to other expansion areas in the region, Frog Pond was incredibly connected. Many cities doing this type of planning had sites that were much more isolated or further out on the cities’ edge, such as being south of Charbonneau. Relatively, Frog Pond was very connected to the Town Center, existing neighborhoods, employment, and Argyle Square. Much of the discussion on the Task Force was to make the most of every possible connection. Connectivity was probably used a lot because it was a highly valued part of the vision of not wanting Frog Pond to feel like it was a satellite, but rather as a part of the community.
 - The word connected did not need to be used three times in the Vision Statement, but the use of it reflected the tone of that conversation.
 - Editing the Vision Statement to collapse all of the connected pieces together was suggested.
 - Substituting convenient for “short bike, walk or bus trip” was recommended, as well as replacing the last “connected” with “integral”.
 - Ms. Mangle agreed to incorporate those changes into the draft that goes to Council on July 21.
- Guiding Principles
 - “Create great neighborhoods” provided a description of what a great neighborhood would look, feel and act like.
 - Neighborhood scale retail was not specifically defined; the intent was not having a major shopping center, but instead a small retail area to serve the neighborhood. Staff would bring a

few different options forward so everyone could discuss whether the retail should be right on the street or internal; who it would serve, and how to make it successful; a few different options exist. The Task Force discussed having something to walk to as being an important part of a walkable neighborhood, not only just as service, but also as a gathering spot.

- The area near Willamette Way E did not function as planned because the project was either too small or not properly sited.
- Ms. Mangle added small retail areas were difficult and not necessarily an automatic part of the market. Leland Consulting Group prepared the market study for this project and believed Frog Pond was a highly viable, possible location because the existing neighborhoods south of Boeckman Rd and Advance Rd would also use it, and because of the traffic on Stafford Rd. Unlike some other small retail areas in Wilsonville, including Villebois, Frog Pond already had pass-by traffic so it was viable, and they certainly would want to set it up for as much likelihood of success as possible to ensure it would work over the long-term.
- While the design of the streets and intersections was very much on the table, no realignment of Stafford Rd or Advance Rd was considered necessary. Stafford Rd was already a boundary for the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), as well as Boeckman Rd, and then with the school site, some fixed points already existed. How new streets should be used to connect the areas in a way that made sense was already being discussed.

Commissioner Hurley arrived at this time.

Discussion continued on the following Guiding Principles with these comments:

- “Frog Pond is an extension of Wilsonville”
 - Cars were not mentioned.
- “Honor Frog Pond’s history” The Frog Pond Grange Hall and history of trees could be retained, recognized and celebrated. The Task Force also felt Frog Pond Lane was an important part of the history of the area. More research was being done on the actual location of the Frog Pond, which could have been built over. A 1914 U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) map showed the historic creek ways on the west side of Stafford Rd, but the map did not show a pond anywhere in the area.
 - This principle would guide that no changes be made to the routing of Stafford Rd.
 - Family names could be used for street names. Kruse Rd at the southern part of the study area was named after a family. More historical family names would likely surface during the process.
- Process Principles.
 - “Create a model that could be used in other communities”
 - Creating such a model was a good byproduct, but creating a community that was interesting for other communities to look at as a standard might not fit Wilsonville’s standard.
 - The idea was that the neighborhood would be something Wilsonville was proud of; aiming for the best was probably a better description.
 - Aim for the best for the Wilsonville community and if it happened to be good for other communities, so be it.
 - No opposition existed to including the principle, but it should be listed last.
 - The principles should be listed logically, and not by priority.

Ms. Mangle said she would make the Commission’s recommended changes and present the Frog Pond Area Plan to City Council at their July 21 meeting. She announced that she would no longer be working on Frog Pond as she was leaving the City August 13 to take another job. Her last Planning Commission meeting would be in August when she would talk about the Basalt Creek Project. She noted that if there was anything she could do to ease the transition, especially for Task Force members, she was happy to help.

B. Industrial Form-Based Code (Neamtzu)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, introduced the first draft of the Industrial Form-Based Code (FBC) and Pattern Book, noting that Staff was excited to hear the Commission’s comments. Creating the Code was

challenging without using a model on which to begin; Staff reviewed the initial draft from the consultants, who made changes resulting in the draft before the Commission. This same presentation would be presented to the City Council in a work session on July 21. Afterward, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) would reconvene, a website would be built, and neighborhood outreach would take place during the summer and into the fall.

Marcie McInelly, President of Urbsworks, Inc., introduced her consultant team, Keith Liden and Joseph Readdy, and noted the Commission had received a complete package related to the Code, which included previous meeting minutes, the Industrial FBC draft, a version of the Pattern Book, and some supplementary materials.

Ms. McInelly presented the City of Wilsonville's Light-Industrial Form-Based Code & Pattern Book project via PowerPoint, paper copies of which were distributed to the Planning Commission, with these key additional comments:

- The Commissioners were asked to focus their attention at a higher level and provide feedback about the components of the regulatory system that was developed, how the Development Standards, FBC and Pattern Book worked together, and the two-track process the team was refining. The two-track process was quite a departure from how the City currently reviewed projects as the roles of Staff and the Development Review Board (DRB) in reviewing projects were changed with greater authority given to Staff.
- The purpose of the project was to create Code amendments related to the Coffee Creek Master Plan, to have clear and objective standards with the potential of being administered by Staff. The draft attempted to create simpler, streamlined path for industrial projects.
 - A FBC approach was used for Section 4.134 Day Road Design Overlay District as clear and objective standards were included, such as setting specific heights and setbacks for buildings, defining specific characteristics for streets, etc. Everything had an urban form emphasis with less emphasis on the land use, which was already designated industrial with some flexibility built in for supplementary uses.
 - The team was also working to build in some very specific adjustments for pre-anticipated situations, so if one was trying, but could not exactly meet a development standard, an allowance was available for making an adjustment, and staff would be able to administer that allowance as well because it was clear, objective and numeric.
 - The Pattern Book was a supplement that detailed alternative approaches to meeting the clear and objective standards using design guidelines that would be administered very similarly to the way projects were administered now, being reviewed by the DRB to determine whether the application was in compliance or not.
- The project site included the Coffee Creek Master Plan area and Day Road Design Overlay District.
- Connectivity was important to the grantor of this project, the Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) arm of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). Part of DLCD's role as the land use side of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was to ensure that planning included a lot of consideration for other modes, even in an industrial area.
 - After a nationwide search for best practices, this would be one of the first FBCs for an industrial area and also a first in terms of the level of connectivity they were trying to achieve.
 - Creating greater connections across industrial sites for pedestrians, bicyclists and cars was not naturally considered for an industrial area because the sites and buildings tend to be very large.
 - Typical developments in this area were reviewed as to how they might conflict with the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) connectivity standards. The team proposed a slightly altered connectivity requirement of about 600 ft to 660 ft, although the right dimension was yet to be determined, that could be met in a variety of ways that offer flexibility for industrial developers.
 - The connectivity standard could be met, for example, through a multi-use path, a multi-use path combined with a local street type of character but as a private easement, or a full-fledged public street, but no requirement to do so existed.
 - This was a challenge because the FBC technique typically tied the development standards to the streets that bound an area. In this case, no streets exist inside the area to be developed, so the team had to first determine the development standard mechanism to create the connectivity and

the future streets and then tie the development standards for the buildings and site design to those future connections.

- Importance of Streamlining. The genesis of this project was the development community giving the team an earful that the Coffee Creek Master Plan did not really speed the review process for industrial buildings. Industrial buildings equal jobs, and the more industrial projects that could be streamlined, the better it would be for Wilsonville.
 - The proposed Two Track System provided an alternative, streamlined path that gave Staff the authority to determine compliance with the clear and objective standards of the FBC. If an applicant could not meet the standards, they would be eligible for the alternative path using the design guidelines administered by the DRB, which was very similar to the existing process.
- Expected Results. The team hoped this streamlined process and refined Development Code would support economic development and job creation and a multi-modal transportation system that accommodated cars, freight, pedestrian, bicycles and transit. They also expected a complete network of new and existing streets to go in as development occurred and that the high quality site, landscape and building design envisioned in the Coffee Creek Master Plan would continue through a simpler process and with more focus on the public realm rather than the building.
- She reviewed the current schedule, which had been extended with an October end date due to concerns expressed about the speed of the project. The project scope was being amended and additional steps and meetings were being added so that the project could really be reviewed thoroughly.
- Next Steps. Three new tasks emerged as being extremely important for the project's success that were being finalized now:
 - Road Test. The team would walk through the proposed process as an applicant to determine whether different options being actually worked. The team would work directly with the Staff who administered the Code to ensure everything had been considered.
 - Urban form testing. The team would 3D model the development standards and design guidelines to illustrate the results that the new Code amendments would have on urban form and public realm design.
 - Code graphics testing. FBCs include a lot more illustrations than conventional codes, especially Wilsonville's Development Code. The team wanted to work directly with the people who published the City's Code to ensure the provided illustrations worked, were readable, useful and fulfilled some of the innovation that FBCs offer, but within the context of Wilsonville's current system.
- She noted several attachments included in the meeting packet and highlighted items for discussion by the Commission as follows:
- The Introductory Memorandum described how the Two Track System would be used (Slide 12).
 - Track One allowed projects to be approved by Staff that complied with all the development standards or with all the development standards and all of the adjustment allowances.
 - Track Two was used if a project did not comply with any or only with some of the development standards. The project must then comply with some or all of the design guidelines in the Pattern Book, whichever development standards were not being complied with, and Staff would prepare a recommendation for applicable design guidelines that would be presented to the DRB for approval.
- Master Organization Table (Attachment A, Pages 9 through 12 of the Staff report) laid out the four components of the proposed regulatory system: the Development Standards and Adjustment Allowance, which were within the FBC, and the Intent Statement and Design Guidelines that were in the Pattern Book.
 - The left hand side of the table identified the four major categories the team believed to be most important to regulate: District Character, Connectivity, Site Design, and Building Design. The table was intended to help track the parallels between the standards in the FBC and the design guidelines.
 - Slide 15 provided an example of how Building Design would be regulated across the system using each of the regulatory system components. For Building Design, the applicant could choose to go through either the Development Standards review with Staff, or the Design Guidelines review with the DRB.
 - Ideally, the applicant could pick and choose which regulation category and track to use.
- The Two Track System provided applicants with multiple options.

- Projects using Track One, the streamlined approval, must comply with all of the development standards for District Character, Connectivity, Site Design, and Building Design. Additionally, projects that comply with development standards and all the adjustment allowances for District Character, Connectivity, Site Design and Building Design would also receive a streamlined approval.
 - An adjustment allowance was a predetermined value built into a design to provide flexibility in anticipation of possible design adjustments. In the Building Design example on Slide 15, a building entrance location could be adjusted by a predetermined distance identified in the adjustment allowance. This adjustment would still be part of Track One; the applicant would not have to go before the DRB to move a building entrance a few feet. The team anticipated that such adjustments would be needed and would build them into the FBC.
- Track Two, Development Review Board Approval, would be used by projects that do not comply with the categories in the Development Standards, even after Adjustment Allowances were applied, and must comply with the Design Guidelines for District Character, Connectivity, Site Design and Building Design.
- She reviewed the feedback the consultant team received over the past several months from the Planning Commission, TAC and Staff with these key additional comments:
 - The Planning Commission was very articulate about the importance of this industrial district and speeding the development of buildings for jobs; however, a high quality design place with a strong sense of place was also important, as such areas attract high quality employers and a trained and talented workforce, all of which was good for the overall economy of Wilsonville and for industrial districts of the new economy.
 - As requested, the consultant team was working to integrate the new regulatory components into the current Development Code and to incorporate the Two Track System into current administrative procedures instead of inventing something new.
 - Leaving nothing “undersigned” was also extremely important. The Commission had to be comfortable with the Code amendments for specific development standards because in a sense, they were being taken out of review later. The Commission was reviewing them now in order to streamline the path through for certain applicants, which was also partly why the team extended the project schedule and added some tasks.
 - While the Commission acknowledged the need for citizen input into the process, the Commission believed trying a Two Track System and instituting something that was truly streamlined should occur in an industrial district where stirring up residents concern was not likely.
 - Staff noted that currently, the clear and objective standards of the FBC were not clearly linked to the Design Guidelines in the Pattern Book, which was something the team would work very hard on in the next draft. The master table provided in the meeting packet was an effort to show where the biggest gaps existed by lining up all of the components together side-by-side.
- She concluded by requesting feedback from the Commission.

Comments and discussion from the Planning Commission, Staff and the consultants regarding the draft Light-Industrial Form-Based Code continued as follows.

Chair Altman suggested that for the Road Test and if room existed in the budget, it would be very helpful to actually apply the process to some existing areas, such as the 95th Ave industrial area to see how it might have come out differently, rather than just doing a typical green field development. Doing so would be very helpful in grasping how the process would be different, while hopefully enhance the outcome.

- Although a 3-D design would be easier to understand, adding the flat surface design would help get a grasp on how those buildings might be different than they were now had the FBC had been in place. He did not know if one particular building stood out because so many were kind of the same. Rather than picking one building, perhaps an area where the building was built should be used instead.

Commissioner Hurley stated the only existing building that stood out was the Nike building because of its mass. He asked if something in the FBC would prohibit a building like that.

Commissioner Levit noted the proposed FBC would require a different shaped building to reduce the appearance of the mass.

Commissioner Millan added the FBC allowed for large developments, but some things had to be done to reduce the large façade of a massive building.

Commissioner Levit:

- Asked if someone wanted to put in a large campus, bigger than 600 ft or 660 ft, did that imply that they would have to have a road through their campus.
 - Ms. McInnelly replied no, the FBC was very flexible. The applicant could have multi-use paths or pedestrian-only paths and still meet the connectivity requirement. It would be very easy to design a connected system of trails or streets that met the connectivity requirements simply by designing the campus well and how people got from building-to-building or from the building to the parking lot and ensuring that people could also go through the site and onto adjacent sites.
- Asked if that should be spelled out as a possibility since it was not clear in the discussion about street spacing.
 - Ms. McInnelly responded it might not be clear now, but the FBC Development Standards provided connectivity standards that listed the distance between connections and then pointed to a menu with a wide range of various connection types to choose from. One could choose to do a simple multi-use or pedestrian-only path or a street on the other side of the spectrum. All of those choices would meet the connectivity requirement and could even be mixed and matched.
 - The three categories of streets were addressing streets, connecting streets and through connections. Addressing streets were the named streets that already existed or were planned. Connecting or supporting streets would generally be streets that came off addressing streets and provided accesses to parking lots; however these streets should be designed to some extent to look and feel like a street. Through connections included a wide variety of connection types to be chosen by the applicant and included everything from a pedestrian path to a bike path to a blend.
 - With all of the connection types, it was possible for a campus to be designed with the natural connections desired between buildings and parking lots to meet the connectivity standards and would not require extra connections that would not be made anyway.
- Believed something seemed to be missing because it was not clear in the information about the FBC that a non-motorized street spacing was an option, even though the third level implied that; it needed to be clarified or stated differently because most people think of roads or boundaries of parcels when discussing spacings of 600 ft or so.
 - Ms. McInnelly stated that this was a really important part of the Code and directed the Commission to page 27 of 114 of the Staff report, which showed the connectivity standards in a diagrammatic form. She noted the figure would be revised and made even clearer, but the maximum spacing shown was either 600 ft or 660 ft. The team was not sure which was the better dimension, but it was different than the TSP-required connectivity standard of 530 ft.
 - The dotted lines that the arrows pointed to showed maximum spacing and could be multi-use paths or pedestrian paths.
 - The actual street design types, shown on pages 25 and 26 of 114, were intended to be very flexible illustrations; the dark gray areas across the sections were the only requirements for the streets.
 - Page 25, Specifications for Supporting Streets, showed a section through a supporting street with a plan view of the same supporting street shown below. All the components in dark gray were required and all of the light gray components were optional. That street would function more like a street.
 - Likewise, the dark gray components on Page 26, Specifications for Through Connections, were the only requirements. So by eliminating all of the optional street components in the center, the minimum standard would be met with a path with a planted area on both sides.
 - The dotted lines on Page 27 indicated elements that needed to be 600 ft apart from each other and could either be a supporting street or a through connection, which was completely up to the developer.

Chair Altman:

- Confirmed that addressing streets had to do with buildings facing the street and that was most likely where the building's address would be located. Addressing streets were the main access streets for getting to a building and everything else was for circulation through the district.
 - Ms. McInnelly added that the addressing streets were public, they already existed or were planned as part of the City's planned street network. All streets inside of the addressing streets, which were supporting streets or through connections, did not need to be public.
- Stated that was not clear and it raised a question about pathways. He noted Mentor Graphics had pathways through their campus and they allowed people to use them, but they were not public easements.
- The Code needed to address somehow how the owner should deal with something like that because specific rules existed regarding private streets and pathways needing to be closed once a year and if the owner did not abide by the rules, private designations could be lost. Such issues had to be clarified so the outcome would be one that was expected, otherwise a pathway might exist that no one could use.

Ms. McInnelly agreed that was a good point and asked Commissioner Levit if that began to answer some of his concerns.

Commissioner Levit:

- Stated he would need to see what the FBC looked like as it progressed; clearly the graphics were meant to be changed and clarified, which was fine.
- Noted the Commission had received the revised Code Section 4.134, and asked that an annotated revision be provided in the future showing the changes made.
- Inquired about the entrance issue with the buildings. He did not recall what was wrong with Day Road Design Overlay and asked why it was suddenly an issue.
 - Mr. Liden stated it promoted visible entries on Day Road. The TAC stated the entry needed to be put where it worked best for the building and provide a functional entry accessible to the parking lot, instead of creating a ceremonial entry in one place. The team took that to heart with the FBC standards and Design Guidelines so the entrance needed to be seen from an addressing street and accessible within a certain distance from the addressing street. The distance that was set allowed the entrance to be on a supporting street or a through connection accessible to parking so more people would access it from that side of the building, but people arriving on foot, via transit or bike from the addressing street would know where to go.
 - Commissioner Postma agreed and added that a lot of discussion at the Task Force regarded whether it was realistic to avoid visitor parking and some notion of immediate access near those entrances. It did not look like the entrance because there was no place for anyone to park or have cars and it did not look like a through street existed there. This resulted in putting people in the middle of a road next to a sidewalk and it ceased to look like an entrance but more like a façade.
- Noted that if development occurred now, the project would go before the DRB, which would be publicized for public comment. With the proposed amendments, projects reviewed by Staff would have no public notification indicating something was happening, which made him uneasy. Clearly, if the project defaulted to the DRB, it would follow regular public announcements, but it seemed that, unless some public review or an announcement were made, things would happen, no one would know in advance, and people would get upset when they found out.
 - Mr. Readdy stated the team was considering using the Class II Administrative Review process currently on the books. Although Class II was a Staff review, prior to Staff's decision public notice was required announcing that an application was being considered and indicating the criteria to be considered. A comment period was provided for people to submit comments to Staff. After Planning Staff made a decision, notice of the decision was sent out. No hearing process would take place, but there would be public notice, so it was different from a Class I, which did not really require much public notice.
 - Mr. Neamtzu confirmed the DRB saw the Class II notifications being processed by Staff and notice of an action was sent to everyone within 250 ft of the site. He imagined all the sites could be posted with A-frame boards that displayed public hearing criteria and contact information on the property

itself. Notice is sent to surrounding property owners and gets posted in four places around the city. It could also be posted in a conspicuous location on the website and it could be published in the Wilsonville Spokesman. The times and dates could be modified and all of the specifics could be discussed, but currently it was a notice of action with no less than a 10-day period for comment, a decision could be rendered on the 11th day and then there was an appeal period. If someone was concerned about it, commented, received notice and was an affected property owner, they could take it up to the DRB first for a full public hearing and from DRB it went to City Council on appeal. The Class II Administrative Review process was successful, but it took time. He believed Commissioner Levit's comments were well taken, but time is money and developers need to go fast, so the team was trying to balance that with the needs of the community.

- The DRB members also had the authority to call up a project that they questioned just like Council did using the call up provision for the actions of the DRB. Several fallback and notification procedures existed that should really be focused on and discussed to ensure all the timeframes were adequate; 10 days might not be enough. Discussing such things was really reasonable and spelling it all out made a lot of sense. The process must be done correctly now before the FBC was implemented.
- Clarified that he was not trying to delay anything, but specific cases existed where the DRB had approved something and then Staff modified it or allowed a modification to it.
 - Mr. Neamtzu replied a Class I level review involved minor modifications that were a judgment call by Staff to a large extent. The Class I process was an over-the-counter review for minor revisions. Class II was for more significant and noticeable types of changes. He added 150 Class I reviews were done every year and that World of Speed had already had seven or eight Class I reviews. World of Speed had a design, but they were a creative bunch and wanted to change, add things and make adjustments and if Staff had to go back through a revision process or back to a board, the process would take years.
- Explained the one case he was concerned about was something that was approved and the feedback he received from Staff was that the developer could not afford to do what they proposed, so they requested something different. It was like a bait and switch and he believed that was wrong in that case. He was not against what actually was built, but the concept was tricky to him
- Mr. Neamtzu clarified that cost was not a criterion.

Commissioner Postma:

- Understood connectivity was related to receiving the grant and that connectivity was an important goal for the community, but he wanted to mirror some of the discussion from the Task Force meeting and comments heard from developers who were in the market. He was concerned about consistently seeing the very first item discussed was building a connectable industrial area, rather than talking about the desire to build a good, aesthetically pleasing and useful industrial zone. While he applauded the notion, he knew developers would not get past paragraph one before saying to themselves that the FBC looked really tough and risky and that they would have to build an industrial zone for many things that would not be required in another jurisdiction.
- Was concerned that putting connectivity, multi-modal travel and similar items right at the forefront was going a bit too far because the project's purpose was to make sure that a good, useful and aesthetically pleasing industrial area was being built and connectivity hopefully came with that, but it was not item number one in his opinion. He noted a few areas where he saw this happening:
 - In the Purpose provision of the revised Section 4.134 on Page 14 of 114, Item A stated, "a multi-modal transportation network" and Item B stated, "an industrial district featuring cohesive high-quality site landscape". Things seemed to be flipped here by telling the developers that the City wanted to build something that was attractive and useful. He did not want to downplay the multi-modal and connectivity but things had to be prioritized.
 - The same thing was being done with site design on page 16 of the FBC book where the developer was being hit over the head again with multi-modal transportation, rather than stating a useful site was wanted.

- Inevitably, Wilsonville was located right along the I-5 corridor, and inevitably some industrial uses in this area would require some freight traffic. If the first sentence talked about multi-modal, the company with freight traffic might feel it was much tougher to do and did not sound as appealing as another city down the corridor. It was just a function of priority and ensuring that one important piece was not overemphasized over the very overarching goal, which was a good, useful and aesthetically pleasing industrial area.
- Noted he had not gone through the FBC document to pick out multiple examples, but he believed keeping that in mind was incredibly important as the project was being drafted. A beautiful plan could be created and he believed the team's work was fantastic, but if development was never built because everyone was terrified to build it, it would not do anyone any good.
 - Ms. McInnelly confirmed the concern involved the messaging and how the order of things indicated a certain priority, which might not be the right messaging. She believed the whole story of connectivity was interesting because most developers in the area would have to meet the TSP requirement for connectivity, which was more restrictive than what the team proposed; perhaps the team needed to clarify that this was more of an industrial size standard.
- Clarified his point was that if developers were told that as the very first thing they would be scared off. Developers would already know they needed to match the TSP going in, but if the very first statement was that the City was creating a very different industrial district that would have a high standard on one thing that normally did not have a high standard, the developers might be put off and interested in going somewhere that did not discuss that right out of the gate, such as Hillsboro.
- Confirmed that reordering the items in Section 4.134(.01) with Item F moved to the top was one prominent example, but he believed there might be other places where that notion came through and that the team needed to go through the whole thing.

Chair Altman agreed with Commissioner Postma's comments up to the point of regarding connectivity. He noted Wilsonville had been fairly lucky, but if the FBC had been in place decades ago, another street would have connected the city north/south on the west side because when Payless went in the big warehouse they vacated Boberg Rd, which connected to Wilsonville Rd. No one thought about it at the time, but now the City was trying to replace that missing link with Kinsman Rd, and 95th Ave tied to Barber St, but did not go through so now offset street intersections existed.

- He suggested that the priority be on the addressing streets, which were critical. Boberg Rd probably would have been an addressing street in this context and those should not be vacated. The whole package had to be understood in terms of putting the pieces together, but at the same time the good strong message of attracting and not scaring off people needed to get out.

Commissioner Greenfield:

- Asked if the DRB's work load would decrease if the FBC was adopted.
 - Chair Altman responded yes, to a certain extent. The DRB would still review the commercial and residential applications and would probably still be pretty busy.
 - Mr. Readdy reminded that this FBC was only for the Coffee Creek Master Plan area; everything was unchanged for the rest of the city.
- Responded that hopefully, that was where the big action would take place.

Commissioner Levit:

- Recalled the FBC mentioning a concern about separating truck traffic from other traffic. He asked whether separate truck delivery streets could be designated in the grid work, so businesses going in could have alternate streets that allowed for heavy truck traffic, which might be more aesthetically pleasing and safer for everyone else, but he did not know how it would work.
- Agreed that if non-vehicular pathways were going to exist, larger vehicles should go around the outside, backside or through a hub system so they were not trying to squeeze onto the little roads. He noted connectivity was still desired, so there would be some crossing, but it would be more controlled.
 - Commissioner Greenfield added a different street-quality grade could be used.

- Noted page 18 of 114 mentioned a parcel driveway width of 24 ft and asked if that was big enough for truck traffic.
 - Ms. McInnelly replied the driveway would be to a parking lot. She read from page 18 stating, “24-foot maximum or it complies with the Supporting Street Standards,” which provided a bit more flexibility and would allow the driveway to be wider.
- Noted page 20 of 114 discussed the location and screening of utilities and services and confirmed that utilities were not permitted to be located on the addressing streets.
- Stated several places mentioned the materials to be used which included concrete for buildings and structures. He asked if that would lead to the same tilt-up construction that existed in so many places.
 - Ms. McInnelly replied it would allow that kind of construction, but did not restrict it.
- Asked if that was something the City wanted or something that was aesthetically pleasing.
 - It was explained the TAC was very clear that the team should not be over-managing the design and architecture of buildings, and that perhaps the Day Road Design Overlay overreached with its emphasis on office-style buildings. While office buildings were certainly welcome and possible under the FBC, the team anticipated that developers building very large buildings would want to build out of cost effective materials including tilt-up. The regulations the team was requesting in the FBC and providing guidance for in the Pattern Book required every building to clearly express a base, a body and a top. Within the tilt-up construction, developer would have to show how they met some articulation at the base, responded to the body and met the sky, in terms of clearly defining the edge of the building. The type of construction could vary from steel framed to concrete block to any number of things including cast in place or tilt-up concrete.
 - Ms. McInnelly stated the beginning of the standards for the base, body and top could be found on page 22 of 114. The team acknowledged that developers may build out of tilt-up, but the articulation of the tilt-up panels would still be required, which provided a bit of a balance between the office-style development of the Day Road Design Overlay and not allowing a material like tilt-up which was likely to be a very common method used for construction, however, some articulation was required to ensure some building features existed.
 - The team knew the building design requirements in the FBC were linked to the frontage requirements for landscaping so they worked together. Large expanses of less-embellished architecture would be screened and enhanced through the required plantings in the front setback, particularly along addressing streets. The team believed the design of the addressing streets, front yard landscape and the buildings themselves having a clear base, body and top should be enough to respond to the industrial context the Commission desired.
- Knew the DRB reviewed several cases where painting or some other articulation was requested for a massive building to address the visual structure but none of that was seen in the FBC. He asked if that was something the Commission should avoid specifying. He added most of the buildings were painted anyway.

Chair Altman said it seemed that the FBC relied more on the physical articulation, both horizontally and vertically, to break up the building. The building would still probably be painted or different materials would be used, but it seemed that was already better addressed in the FBC than in the current Development Code, which really did not state much other than identifying the setback. Although the DRB often asked for such things, no guidance really existed in the design criteria.

Commissioner Millan responded that the current Code was missing the base design and top design, and those two components would make the building more attractive because some delineation was required.

Ms. McInnelly stated the clear and objective Development Standards, which were criteria that must be met in order to go through the streamlined Track One process, were very specific and no judgment call was needed to determine if the criteria were met. Someone would go through the Design Guidelines if they wanted to do something they felt could not be met, such as having more articulation on their building or using a different material. She believed the Design Guidelines could still be used with an office building palette of materials. The Development Standards were different than the Design Guidelines. The team was trying to write

something that would lead to improved building and public realm design and site design that could be administered by Staff, because right now it was a judgment call by the DRB on every project.

Commissioner Levit said he knew Staff was really good, but they had also overlooked things because it was impossible to keep everything in mind. He asked if the FBC would assist Staff by making it easier for them to review, approve and understand that what was presented met the criteria.

- Ms. McInnelly replied yes, adding that was why the Code graphics testing, 3-D testing and Road Test were added. All three team members had a major role to play in those steps and would be having conversations with Staff about whether or not the tools helped them do their job, if they could easily administer the FBC and more easily make decisions, or were the tools not quite working. The team would then refine the tools to ensure that they worked.

Chair Altman referenced his earlier comment about applying the FBC process to an existing area and noted that it would be helpful to address some of the questions the DRB struggled with about how the FBC would have affected the existing basic tilt-up concrete buildings.

Commissioner Greenfield:

- Believed the team had been very thorough. One area of particular interest to him was the public realm. He understood the public realm regarded the streets, particularly the addressing streets and façades facing them, but he was also interested in the interior spaces of the development. At one point, the team referred to outdoor rooms, which was an interesting concept. The outdoor rooms were spaces between, behind and beside buildings that needed to be regarded as positive spaces to work well, instead of something that was simply leftover when the buildings were plopped down. The spaces should be functional, attractive and integrated with what went on inside the buildings that faced on these spaces. He was unsure whether the Code was very explicit about how these spaces could be built into the overall project. It seemed most of the focus was on the addressing street façades.
 - Ms. McInnelly replied it might seem that way, but the team had put a lot of thought into it. Development on a supporting street or through connection had some requirements regarding how much of the building must be near the street and how much of the façade must be transparent. The team had not ignored the inner streets at all and in fact, some of the same types of requirements for buildings located on addressing streets were also required for buildings located on a through connection.
 - For a lot that was completely located inside a block and not adjacent to an addressing street, all of the requirements for facing and addressing streets for frontage and transparency transferred to the nearest internal connection the developer made.
 - The team treated all of the connections, including the internal, as part of the public realm. Although not literally public, they would probably be easements or they might be private, but they would be part of a public realm network. She noted would want to deemphasize that and tell the story right so it would not scare developers off.
 - The end goal was that the connections inside would still have high quality façades and buildings facing them. Buildings inside the block had a responsibility to face the connections with some of the same architectural thought that would have to be met on an addressing street. However, the hierarchy was more toward facing the addressing street with a prominent entrance that was visible from the addressing street.
- Stated he was looking for some direction to developers about how these spaces should be defined to ensure they functioned as outdoor rooms, or what established gateways, corners and gathering places.

Chair Altman assumed that, while the Staff level review would be the more clear and objective approach, the Pattern Book would still be available as a guide for Staff to refer to in a preapplication meeting to provide examples of the elements being discussed and what the City was working to accomplish. He had not thought about that approach when he looked through the Pattern Book, but it occurred to him that the key to not scaring people off in terms of connectivity was getting the developers to think about those things when designing their project because typically the building was laid out and everything else fit around it because developers looked to the Code. A need existed to educate them up front which could mean more of an

emphasis on the preapplication input to get developers to seriously focus on connectivity in the public realm and the whole people place thing as a key design element and not just building the building and making parking and access to it work which was how it worked now. The developers needed to be guided and structuring the Pattern Book so that it laid out that sequence of thinking about the public realm, Staff might be able to get them to think that way without scaring them off.

Commissioner Greenfield:

- Said he was pleased to see a nod in a few places to the needs of visitors and the people working in the buildings, as the public realm that he was concerned about in the interior blocks; the spaces those people could use and would find attractive and that were welcoming and relieved the life inside the buildings. That was the public realm, not just the automobile traffic passing by and the literal public domain.
- Also expressed concern about the issue of property line boundaries and how crossable they were to ensure the area was really connected. If people were not free to walk across a property from one place of business to another through the interior of the development, the idea of achieving connectivity would fail in a very important way. He did not know how that could be mandated by Code, but believed it certainly needed to be a principle that developers buy into.
 - Ms. McInnelly added some concern also existed about that connectivity continuing across addressing streets as well because they created big boundaries. She noted the connection that the team talked about creating across the area was smaller grained than the intersections of addressing streets, so there probably would need to be some provision made for crossing the addressing streets mid-block in the future.

Commissioner Levit:

- Noted that people using the connections when commuting and at lunchtime if they wanted to take a walk was previously discussed, but he did not see any way that places or destinations for workers to go to get lunch could exist within the concept. The concept was missing destinations as a purpose for the connectivity. Having a minimum building height of 30 ft was an awful lot for a Starbucks or a developer wanting to put in a building that would offer places to eat and socialize.
 - Commissioner Postma commented that because the location was somewhat remote, one would be forced to hop in a car to get to lunch.
- Responded that was precisely his point, the location was so remote that people would drive anyway, so connectivity was of lesser value.
- Clarified that given the way the area was developed, there was no place for people to go. If employees had an hour for lunch, they would have to walk 20 minutes in each direction, making for a pretty rushed lunch. Considering what was currently there, from Day Road one would have to walk all of the way around to Commerce Circle to reach the first place to eat, and that was if they happened to be on the east end of Day Rd, but they could not walk if they were in the internal blocks of the area.
 - Mr. Neamtzu explained the Code would permit the 5,000 sq ft per building in the Regionally Significant Industrial Area, so it was reasonable to expect that a bunch of different types of services could exist depending on the density of the employment center. The FBC would permit a sandwich shop and other services in Coffee Creek.
- Replied it might be good for the Pattern Book to stimulate the thought that more amenities needed to be available to the workers. At one point, a discussion took place regarding small pocket parks along the railroad or the waysides, which was good for recreation or as a destination, but not for lunch.

Commissioner Hurley asked if Commissioner Levit wanted a requirement added to the FBC or if the option should just be made available so an entrepreneur could come in and open a sandwich shop.

Commissioner Levit replied he would like it to be an option and not required.

Commissioner Postma clarified that the design standards prevented that option now because of the size of buildings being discussed. He was unsure if much of an opening existed for smaller buildings to be tenanted.

Commissioner Hurley understood that they would have to be a subtenant.

Ms. McInnelly stated 5,000 sq ft was allowed as an accessory to another larger industrial building.

Commissioner Postma responded that was too large for a restaurant as 2,500 sq ft was considered big.

- Ms. McInnelly clarified 5,000 sq ft was the maximum allowance, so two, 2,500-sq ft spaces could be built.

Chair Altman added the spaces could actually be moved around in a multi-tenant building.

Mr. Neamtzu noted there could be up to 20 tenants in a multiple building complex.

Chair Altman believed the plan and FBC allowed the mix, but he agreed it was important to build into the thought process that connectivity ought to have a function because it would be nice to have things to go to, maybe even to the extent that portable food trucks should be allowed.

Commissioner Hurley remarked that a food truck and picnic tables could be put inside a fenced off loading bay as a covered restaurant. The loading bay could be subleased as a pop up restaurant area that would be covered from the Oregon weather for nine months out of the year.

Mr. Neamtzu recognized this was a lot of material, so he was open to taking comments as the Commission digested the information. He noted the team was regrouping in a number of different ways and that these conversations would continue, so Commissioners were invited to send him ideas for the team. A lot more input would be received from City Council at their next meeting which would be important because the Councilors that had taken part in the Day Road Design Overlay would remember the conversations and want to ensure that the proposed FBC would still create a high-quality visual environment. He believed the City had a great rough draft to start working on and he thanked the team for all their hard work.

Commissioner Postma congratulated the team for their great work on something that was brand new.

Mr. Neamtzu confirmed people in the market had not seen the draft yet. Now that the project had been published, he could get it into the TAC's hands. The team needed to continue with the next steps of building the website, getting the draft and information posted on the website, reaching out to property owners and holding another TAC meeting and several more work sessions.

Chair Altman asked if holding a joint TAC and Planning Commission meeting was possible, so the Commission could get TAC's input.

Commissioner Postma stated it would be good for the Commissioners to hear from people in the market because the TAC and consultant team really got an education hearing from them.

Mr. Neamtzu added the TGM program liked efficiencies in meetings, so combining one was a good suggestion.

Commissioner Greenfield asked how this project related to the Day Road Design Overlay. Was the Overlay being superceded or amended?

Chair Altman confirmed the Day Road Overlay was being replaced and the new proposed Light-Industrial Form-Based Code would apply to the entire Coffee Creek area, not just the Day Rd frontage. The feedback was that the decisions reflected in the Day Road Overlay would not work very well and must be replaced.

Commissioner Postma added the feedback was that if the City insisted upon the Overlay, it would never happen.

Chair Altman agreed, there would be a strip down Day Road with nothing there.

Commissioner Millan asked what the objection was to the Day Road Overlay.

Commissioner Postma explained the Day Road Overlay District was almost set to mimic Kruse Way in Lake Oswego, and those in the market said it could not be done because the area was too remote from the freeway, access was a serious problem, the amount of bodies would cause traffic problems and realistically, that did not reflect Wilsonville, so it would not work and they could not sell it.

Chair Altman added the overlay imposed Class A office design on an industrial district, which did not work.

Commissioner Postma added it lacked flexibility altogether.

Commissioner Millan asked if there was a concept or picture of the kind of industry that would be going in the area, such as light manufacturing, perhaps.

Commissioner Postma believed the market people said it would be similar to what the City currently had had gotten inquiries about doing projects like the Rockwell Collins buildings but such projects could not be built there so the developers had to look elsewhere. He believed their notion was that those were the kind of clientele that might be available if enough flexibility existed in the program to make it work.

Mr. Liden added any building that met the Day Road Design Overlay standards would still be possible under the new Coffee Creek Master Plan Design Overlay. The team was not rejecting the Day Road Design Overlay, but instead, taking the parts that were most manageable, most appealing and most implementable and incorporating those into the new standards while leaving out things that were keeping people from making progress.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2014 Planning Commission Work Program

Commissioner Levit asked if anything had been decided about how the City would accept the French Prairie Bridge grant and if so, would work on the bridge begin anytime soon.

Mr. Neamtzu stated he would get an update, adding he had not heard anything since the last press release. A project manager had been assigned to the project. Staff had met with several consultants interested in doing the work and work continued with ODOT on the intergovernmental agreement (IGA), all of which were tediously slow, mind-numbing processes. The project was moving forward, but it was not teed up quite yet.

- He did not know the details regarding the City's acceptance of the grant, which were part of the IGA, but he would send that information to the Commission. He reviewed the two financial options presented with the grant, noting that each decision involved lots of money and different processes, so many existing complications needed to be worked out.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:16 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant